DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 619 24 HE 000 992

By-Bloland, Harland G.

Higher Education Associations in a Decentralized Education System.

California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.

Bureau No-BR-5-0248-2-6

Pub Date 69

Contract-OEC-6-10-106

Note-214p.

EDRS Price MF-$1.00 HC-$10.80

Descriptors-Educational Legislation, Faculty Organizations, *Federal Aid, *Higher Education, Legislation, *National Organizations, *Policy Formation, Political Socialization, *Professional Associations

Identifiers-*Higher Education Associations, Politicization

This study of higher education associations in Washington DC examines the relationship of their proliferation and politicization to increased federal involvement in higher education. Shortly after World War II, many voluntary higher education associations established offices in Washington DC as an indication of their interest in shaping federal educational policy. They have been important in preserving the autonomy of the decentralized education system in its deepening relationship with the government. There are differences in the degree to which they function as significant links between the government and academic community. Those representing institutions have tended to promote: institutional support for universities that would give academic administrators full responsibility for allocating funds within the institution; increased federal aid to previously "deprived" areas (e.g., humanities); and reduction of the indirect costs of federally sponsored research. Many professional associations promote discipline interests. Faculty oriented organizations have defended academic status and autonomy within the university. Special task organizations focus on specific problems of development, coordination, programs, etc. Politicization of the associations has been nurtured by political and social factors and by the development of effective cooperative arrangements among the various groups. (JS)

ED029619

BR-5-0248
PA-24
OE-BR

HIGHER EDUCATION ASSOCIATIONS IN A DECENTRALIZED EDUCATION SYSTEM

By
Harland G. Bloland

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

1969

Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education
University of California
Berkeley, California

HE000992

Table of Contents

CHAPTER PAGE

Acknowledgements v

I. Introduction 1

II. Development of Federal Government-Higher Education Relations 13

III. National Associations and Higher Education 36

IV. Types of Higher Education Associations and Federal Government Relations 63

V. Constraints on Political Activity 116

VI. Decision Making in a Coalitional Context 131

Appendixes 174

A. List of Higher Education Associations by Type

B. Number and Percentage of Higher Education Associations with Offices in Washington, D. C., by Type of Association

C. Constituent Organization Members and National Organizations Which Are Associated Organization Members of the American Council on Education, 1966

D. Organizational Participants in Higher Education Groupings in Washington

References 195

Acknowledgements

This study was made possible by the financial support of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at the University of California at Berkeley, to which I am very much indebted.

In conducting the research and preparing the manuscript, I benefited greatly from the advice and criticism of a number of persons. First of all, I am deeply grateful to Professor Burton Clark, who guided this work from its inception. I also wish to thank Professor Alan Wilson for his valuable comments on the original draft of the manuscript. Troy Duster, Ellen Gumperz, and Terry Lunsford, of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, were provocative critics of early reports on the research, and contributed much to the development of the ideas on which the final writing is based.

I also wish to express my gratitude to the many persons, both in and out of government, who consented to be interviewed in the course of my fieldwork in Washington, D. C., in 1966-67. Among these, Russell Thackrey of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and F. L. Wormald and the late Harrison Sasscer of the Association of American Colleges were particularly helpful in providing comments on drafts of this work. Naturally, however, ultimate responsibility for all errors in fact and judgment is my own. My thanks go also to John Warner, whose very competent and perceptive editing contributed much to the style and clarity of the finished manuscript.

And finally, I wish to acknowledge my overall indebtedness to my wife, Sue Bloland, for the intellectual stimulation she provided throughout the course of this research, and for her great patience and understanding.

I

Introduction

Much has been written about the impact of government support on institutions of higher education, stressing the influence of government interests and policies on the organization and functioning of universities and colleges (Kidd, 1959; Orlans, 1962; 26 campuses, 1963). Federal interest and support have also had profound impact, however, upon the supra-institutional organization of higher education. This study concerns the changing structure of higher education in the United States today and, particularly, patterns of national organization which have recently emerged in response to the increasing involvement of the federal government in higher education.

Centripetal and centrifugal tendencies characterize American higher education today. The value traditionally placed on institutional autonomy by American educators is still a strong force in maintaining decentralized formal authority. However, new efforts are being made at state and regional levels to achieve ordered division of labor among diverse colleges and universities by developing statewide coordinating councils and regional associations. Also, the growing importance of higher education for the national economy and welfare has increased a tendency for the federal government to have a hand in important educational decisions. Such government involvement,this study will suggest, has provided a major stimulus to the elaboration of national structures within higher education, encouraging proliferation and adaptation of educational organizations and groups to serve as connectors between formally autonomous segments of higher education and government agencies. Utilized extensively by government as sources of information and advice on various higher education activities, and by academicians as instruments through which to participate in shaping higher education policy, these structures provide an interorganizational context for educational decision making on the national level and for the development of new patterns of informal influence among institutions and larger segments of the higher education system.

EDUCATION AS A FORMALLY DECENTRALIZED SYSTEM

Education in the United States has not traditionally been viewed as a system, largely because it is not a formally centralized national system with authority concentrated in a central agency or a ministry of education. Formally, American education consists of many state and local systems, with few direct connections among them or between them and the national government. Recently, however, students of American education have begun to emphasize that a description of the school system which focuses only on its formal decentralization of authority overlooks important sources of system integration on the national level--sources essential to the functioning of the educational enterprise. Wayland (1964) points out, for example, that "ancillary structures" provide critical linkages among levels or segments of American education in lieu of integrative structures within the formal system. Wayland defines "ancillary structures" as "deliberately and formally organized systems not a part of the formal organization, which contribute to the functioning of the education system in specific ways /p. 589/," and he stresses that "structures which are parts of the formal organization in many countries of the world are defined as ancillary structures in the United States /p. 596/." For example, in educational systems characterized by strong central control, educational standards are set and maintained by structures with formal authority. In the United States, on the other hand, private testing and accrediting associations function to standardize educational activities at different levels of the system, making it possible for students to move from one level to another (as well as from one school or college to another across the system) without encountering severe discontinuities. In the study of American education, then, an examination of ancillary structures illuminates a degree of coherence not apparent in the formal organization of the system and draws attention, as well, to important changes occurring in the structure of the educational enterprise as ancillary organizations proliferate and assume new functions.

In his analysis of the structural features of American education, Wayland focuses on the role of ancillary structures as linkages within the educational enterprise--as interconnections among educational subsystems, serving in lieu of a central ministry with formal coordinative authority over the larger system. The present study focuses on the tendency of ancillary structures to serve also as linkages between the educational system and other institutional systems with which education is increasingly interdependent in modern society. Thus, for example, as the need of the federal government for the products of higher education and the need of colleges and universities for federal support have heightened the mutual involvement of these formally independent spheres, higher education ancillary organizations have functioned increasingly as connectors between them.

This work is particularly concerned with one type of ancillary structure--the national voluntary association--which has come to perform a vital linkage function in government-higher education relations in the absence of strong bureaucratic machinery for ordering the extensive interaction between these spheres. Associations tend, in all realms of American life, to act as connectors between their members and levels of government. In the words of La Palombara (1964), associations

> . . .can provide an orderly, predictable means of transmitting demands to the authoritative structures. They also serve as significant instruments through which authoritative structures communicate to the governed and reactions of the latter are fed back to governors. It is difficult, indeed, to conceive of a modern, large-scale democratic system functioning adequately without a well-developed associational interest-group structure [p. 126].

In this sense, then, these ancillary organizations serve the integration of the larger decentralized sociopolitical system of which the national government and higher education are a part. The concern here, however, is not with educational association behavior as it contributes to the functioning of American democracy. Our concern is more narrowly with the consequences, for the national organization of higher education, of the development of persistent and patterned associational linkages between higher education groups and institutions of government.

PATTERNS OF INFLUENCE IN A DECENTRALIZED HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM

Clark (1965) has pointed out that the study of decentralized systems of action, such as the American educational system, requires interorganizational as well as intraorganizational analysis. Systems in which formal authority is decentralized exhibit patterns of influence which are significantly different from the patterns typically found within bureaucratic structures. In the decentralized system, the efforts of autonomous units must be concerted "without the authority of formal hierarchy and employee status [p. 233]." Cooperative action is voluntary, "concerted by the leverage of money and prestige and the limited confluence of independent interests [p. 224]." Interorganizational analysis (in contrast to intraorganizational analysis) focuses attention on patterns of cooperative interaction in situations of unstructured authority.

An interorganizational framework, Clark asserts, is particularly useful in the study of new patterns of influence developing in American education.

> In some countries the study of influence in education must begin with the fact that there is a national organization of education with important elements of hierarchical and formal control from national ministries to the region, the community, and the individual school or college. In such countries, educational organization or educational administration or educational policy is related to this formal national system. This relationship is lacking in the United States, but an attempt is now being made to exert influence from the national center, and much of this influence flows outside bureaucratic channels /pp. 233-234/.

The study of centralizing tendencies in American education thus requires an analytical focus on interorganizational relationships among autonomous organizations and groups engaged in voluntary forms of limited co-operative alliance. The emerging patterns of informal influence which this analytical approach can illuminate represent, according to Clark, "ways of influencing the grass roots level of operation in a field where no formal authority can impose co-operation/p. 229/."

The present study seeks to describe and analyze emerging interorganizational patterns in higher education, focusing on the role of associations as instruments through which informal influence is exerted not only outward from the national center to the "grass roots level of operation," but also inward from dispersed institutions and groups to the national center, and particularly to the federal government.

SOME HYPOTHESES REGARDING THE BEHAVIOR OF INTEREST GROUPS

The role of associations as mechanisms of influence in decentralized systems of action has long been of concern to students of interest group behavior in the United States; some questions and hypotheses suggested by political scientists in the literature on interest groups have guided the study at hand.

One major stimulus to the formation of voluntary associations in any institutional sphere of American society, according to David Truman (1955), is increased government activity in that sphere. Thus, for example, labor and trade associations proliferated rapidly during World War I when

> . . .the responsibility of the government for a suddenly increased measure of economic planning in order to satisfy the needs of war led it to invite and encourage the establishment of associations that could simplify its task of eliciting information and coordinated action /p. 26/.
>
> In recruiting the national resources for such an emergency, the Government stimulates interaction throughout the nation. . . . Once the habit of associated activity was established under the stimulus of government encouragement, most such groups tended to persist and to invite imitation /p. 55/.

A significant number of higher education associations with offices in Washington, D. C., have come into existence as a direct result of government encouragement, most notably during World War II. Even more numerous in Washington, however, are offices of national associations which originated for purposes quite unrelated to higher education-federal government relations, but which were stimulated to establish organizational representatives in the Capital because of government involvement in programs affecting their members. Truman's generalization emphasizes the importance of national government activity as a stimulus to the creation of new organizational linkages between higher education and government agencies, although frequently, this study suggests, the linkage role is assumed by organizations which originated independently for quite different purposes.

This study concerns, then, both the proliferation and the "politicization" of national higher education associations in recent decades as a result of growing government involvement in higher education programs. Chapter 2 provides a summary picture of the gradual expansion of federal support for higher education in the United States since the framing of the Constitution and describes briefly the range of educational ancillary structures which have emerged--primarily in the 20th century--to deal with the government. Chapter 3 discusses the voluntary association as a special type of ancillary organization, as well as the social and political conditions which have contributed to the formation and development of voluntary associations in the United States generally, and within higher education specifically. Chapter 4 offers a typology of higher education associations, pointing up differences in the specific organizational interests which have drawn (or are drawing) several types of associations into an active relationship with the national government and the degree to which associations of these types function presently as important connectors between the academic community and the government. Following a discussion in Chapter 4 of the pressures on associations of higher education to politicize, Chapter 5 describes some constraints on this politicization process, which have had an impact, as well, on the role which academic associations play as spokesmen for higher education in Washington.

A second hypothesis to be examined here is stated by Eldersveld (1958) in a discussion of the changing nature of interest group behavior in the United States today. He suggests that the objectives of interest groups can no longer be defined simply as gaining access to agencies or officials of government for the purpose of representing or articulating group viewpoints.

> Although historically representation and access may have been the goal, the shift in objectives has led to groups concerned with ongoing political and social relationships, desiring to penetrate deeper into the political and social structure, not periodically and intermittently, but continuously and for the purpose of developing and sustaining contact and influence with the significant opinion and action leadership of the community. The group perspectives are no longer merely specific and limited but long-range and comprehensive [p. 192].

Chapters 4 and 6 of this work attempt to show that an objective of one group of higher education associations in particular can be characterized as "sustained contact and influence" with federal agencies and officials playing a major role in higher education policy. A visible consequence of this objective is the development within these associations of organizational machinery for handling the ongoing tasks which participation in the policy process entail (for example, monitoring government programs or arranging for members to testify before, or advise, legislative and administrative committees of government).

Another hypothesis, also from Eldersveld (1958), suggests that a consequence of the desire of interest groups to establish and maintain an effective voice in the shaping of federal policy is the use of a "strategy" of intergroup relations, which includes:

> . . .bargaining, negotiating, coalescence, reciprocation, even combination and continued alliance. Such attempts to limit competition result in less group autonomy. . . . The processes of sharing expertise, intel-

> lectual resources, financial resources, personnel, as well as attitudes has become much more prevalent and important than formal organizational liaison and cooperation. This intergroup bargaining process has become much more essential today in the U. S. in our fluid power context [p. 194].

An important factor in the behavior of interest groups in the United States today, according to Eldersveld, is the constraint on group competition which results from "an awareness of the limitations of their power [p. 194]" as autonomous units. According to a report published by the U. S. Chamber of Commerce (Hall, 1965), executives of national associations attributed changes in associational interest group behavior to a tendency on the part of Congress to

> . . .favor bills brought in by a "united front," since such bills are said to indicate resolution of potential conflict within an industry, and thus the bill's passage will offend no major groups concerned. Association personnel feel that the same process has begun to be characteristic of the executive branch of government as well, that "government bureaus, already impatient with having to deal with multiple organizations representing various facets of the same industry, will increase the pressure for amalgamation [pp. 33-34]."

Dealing regularly with the federal government, then, places pressures on voluntary associations to engage in intergroup bargaining and alliance for the purpose of maximum effectiveness in affecting federal policy. Chapter 6 of this study focuses on the structure of intergroup relations among higher education associations in Washington, examining the effect upon interorganizational behavior of the desire of such associations to maximize their effectiveness as participants in the federal policy process.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study was conceived as an exploratory investigation into the activities of higher education associations in Washington, D. C., and was guided by a number of broad questions rather than by a set of well-developed hypotheses requiring validation through field research. The hypotheses presented above--toward which the present report is addressed--were drawn from the literature on associations as part of the ongoing process through which the focus of the study was gradually defined. In this process, informal interviews conducted in Washington, D. C., (during the summer and fall of 1966) played an important part in directing the investigator's attention to specific problem areas, while a variety of published materials were drawn upon to corroborate and extend the insights and information gained from interviews.

About 70 interviews were conducted in Washington, the majority with executive secretaries and other staff members of associations, with university representatives having independent offices in Washington, with government officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and of the National Science Foundation, and with Congressional staff members. These interviews were largely unstructured, but questions on each of the following topics were asked of all association personnel: 1) the origin of the respondent's association and its primary purposes and activities; 2) the reason for the establishment of an association office in Washington; 3) the nature of the relationship between the Washington office and the association membership (including the leadership function of the central office and forms of communication between office staff and the membership); 4) the type and amount of contact between this association and others in Washington; and 5) the relationship between this association and the federal government (both the amount of contact between association personnel and federal officials and the nature of that contact, with special emphasis on changes which have occurred in government-association relations in the last five to ten years). As the investigation gradually became centered on one particular group of associations, representatives of those organizations were reinterviewed with particular stress on topics 4 and 5.

This general format was revised, as appropriate, for interviews with government officials and other respondents not directly connected with the associations themselves.

These interviews ranged in duration from one to three hours, and provided an indispensable guide to the problems and issues which have preoccupied association personnel and government officials concerned with higher education legislation in the 1960's.

In addition to the interviews conducted in Washington, the investigator was also able to attend the annual meetings of a number of higher education associations as well as a number of informal interorganizational meetings among the executive staffs of these associations.

Although observation and interviews in the field were of primary importance in gaining familiarity with the Washington scene and in narrowing the focus of the study, published materials were utilized extensively to corroborate and elaborate impressions formed in the field. Heavy reliance on public documents in this investigation resulted, in part, from the abundance and quality of published records pertaining to both association and government activity in Washington.

As democratic organizations, supported primarily by dues from a widely dispersed membership, national associations have a continual need to account to their members for the activities of the paid office staff and of the elected association officers. Such accounting frequently is embodied in annual reports and house journals, sometimes supplemented by association newsletters. Addressed to an audience of professional peers (and infrequently perused by, although available to, the general public) these reports generally contain detailed descriptions of, and careful justification for, the work being done by association personnel on the membership's behalf. In addition, organizational publications often provide avenues for public expression of members' views on association policy and activity in sections devoted to letters or other forms of member comment. Such publications can be a valuable source of insight into internal organizational relations as well as into the activities of organizational representatives in a wider social context. They are most reliable, however, when interpreted in the light of informal interview data on association affairs and in the light of some understanding of the broader social and political milieu within which associations operate. The sociological and political science literature on associations, interest groups, and on national governmental structure and processes contributed importantly in this research to the interpretation of association records.

In using government documents, as in using association publications, the difficulty is more often with an overabundance than with a scarcity of materials. Published House and Senate hearings and committee reports, the Congressional record, and the publications of the U.S. Office of Education and the National Science Foundation provided essential aids to the understanding of legislative issues and events, and they constituted an important form of documentary evidence for the analysis presented here.

Ultimately, it is the purpose of an exploratory study to suggest and define problem areas for future research and to provide some conceptual orientation for that research. Some suggestions regarding a further direction and procedure for investigation into the role of national higher education associations are offered in the Conclusion section of Chapter 6.

II

Development of Federal Government-Higher Education Relations

In the American federal system, no ministry or department of the national government coordinates educational activities. Responsiblity for educational administration rests, rather, with state and local governments and with private groups. No mention of education is made in the U. S. Constitution, and legal authority for decentralized control of schools has been based on the tenth admendment of the Constitution which reads: "The powers not delegated to the U. S. by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people."

As a result of this formal decentralization of authority, the higher education "system" in the United States has developed largely through the piecemeal response of educational institutions to a myriad of local and private interests and needs rather than in accordance with any overall national plan. Many kinds of vital decisions regarding the size, location, and nature of colleges and universities have been made independently by state, local, and private authorities. As a result, higher education in the United States has come to be characterized by extraordinary diversity--a diversity which has been valued by American educators as a particular strength of the higher education system, in keeping with the pluralistic quality of American life.

Despite the traditional American belief in the virtues of local control and varied sources of support for education, however, the growing importance of higher education in modern industrial life has brought about the increasing involvement of the federal government in higher education affairs. In recent decades, federal resources have become a major form of support for many colleges and universities in the nation, and, as a result, the government has played an increasingly important part in shaping the character and development of the national higher education enterprise.

HISTORICAL REVIEW

Until the beginning of World War II, education could be said to have played an essentially passive or dependent role in its interrelationship with other major institutions in American society, conserving the social order rather than functioning to promote social and economic change (Clark, 1962). American colleges and universities had ceased during the 19th century to function soley for the purpose of producing "gentlemen" and of preserving established elites. The industrialization process of the middle and late 19th century--with accompanying changes in the structure of the labor force--had placed demands upon educational institutions at all levels of the system to provide ever greater amounts of skilled manpower to meet rising national needs. But the importance of higher education to the expanding national economy was to become greater still during the years of World War II and the postwar scientific revolution, when American universities and colleges became the critical loci of manpower training and of scientific research. During these years, higher education emerged as a vital innovative resource for the national economy--and consequently for the national defense and welfare--bringing it inevitably into the forefront of federal government concern. At the same time, the rising costs of extensive training and research facilities have brought institutions of higher education to rely more and more heavily on the resources of the federal government.

Higher education expenditures just prior to World War II (1939-40) totaled $678.6 million. By 1951-52, they were up to almost $2.5 billion, and by 1965-66 they had reached an estimated $12 billion. Total expenditures for higher education in 1975-76 have been projected at $22.9 billion (Simm and Fullum, 1966). As the costs of higher education soar, the national government emerges as the only agency capable of sustaining adequate support for this massive enterprise.

A number of Constitutional provisions have provided legal bases for federal participation in the educational sphere (Quattlebaum, 1951). They include such diverse items as federal jurisdiction over Washington, D. C., (giving the government authority over education in the District of Columbia) and implied federal power to govern territories and possessions (Article 1, Section 8). In fact, the 1931 report of the Hoover-appointed National Advisory Committee on Education listed 14 warrants for federal support of education. But the Constitutional clause granting Congress the "Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States /Article 1, Section 8/" has been especially important in legitimating federal aid to education, just as it has been a major justification for government intervention in the economy.

As Babbidge and Rosenzweig (1962) suggest, much of the history of government participation in, and support of, higher education activities can be viewed as an

> . . .extension of the principle established early in the union, namely, that the expenditure of Federal funds for educational purposes and the use of educational institutions were justified in the effort to produce highly or uniquely trained personnel to meet identifiable needs of the National Government /p. 7/.

The concept of allocating federal money and land for the purpose of meeting "national needs" has been central to the legitimation of all government participation in higher education programs since early in the history of the United States.

The federal government began providing instruction for Armed Forces personnel in 1777 and established the first federal institution of higher education, the Military Academy at West Point, in 1802 (Legislative Reference Service, 1961). Aid to education in the territories and states, through the endowment of schools with public lands, began as early as 1785 (Quattlebaum, 1960).

It was in 1862, however, that the first major legislation concerning American higher education was passed by Congress. The growing need for agriculturally and industrially skilled manpower in a rapidly expanding economy led, in that year, to the passage of the Morrill Land-Grant Act, which allocated public lands or land scrip in each state of the union for the support of institutions of higher education. Ten percent of the proceeds of the sale of this land could be used to buy a site for a college or land for an experimental farm (Rudolph, 1965). The remainder was to be invested or loaned to maintain a perpetual fund, "the capital of which should remain forever undiminished /Eddy, 1956/." Through the provisions of this Act, the federal government sought to promote instruction, particularly in public colleges and universities, in the "agricultural and mechanic arts." The first Morrill Act, Rudolph points out, gave strong impetus to the development of vocational and technical training programs as

> a legitimate function of American higher education. . .Everywhere the idea of going to college was being liberated from the class-bound, classical-bound traditions which for so long had defined the American collegiate experience /p. 263/.

Supplementing this legislation was the second Morrill Act (1890), which granted federal funds on an annual basis to land-grant institutions and broadened the range of technical programs aided, again to promote instruction in areas of national need. According to Eddy (1956):

> The money was to be applied "only to instruction in agriculture, the mechanic arts, the

> English language and the various branches of mathematical, physical, natural and economic science, with special reference to their applications in the industries of life, and to the facilities for such instruction [p. 102]."

The impact of federal support on institutions of higher education was to be greatly expanded in the 20th century, as economic and international crises led to a broadened definition of the legitimate domain of national government in the United States and stimulated federal agencies to utilize the manpower and research resources of American colleges and universities to fulfill national needs. During World War I, the National Defense Act of 1916 established the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps program, through which military officers were trained on the campuses of American colleges and universities. In 1926, the Contract Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps was similarly established (Legislative Reference Service, 1961). During the Depression years of the 1930's, temporary federal support of numerous educational programs was provided through the Federal Emergency Relief Administration; federal aid to college students became available through the National Youth Administration; and funds were made available to states and cities, through the Public Works Administration, for construction of college buildings (Quattlebaum, 1960).

It was World War II, however, which precipitated involvement of institutions of higher education with the national government to an unprecedented degree, in a pattern of mutual dependence which has persisted to the present day. Colleges and universities participated, for example, in training national manpower through the Engineering, Science and Management War Training Program, which involved over 1,500,000 persons (Allen, 1950). The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 was even more extensive, making almost every veteran of World War II eligible for educational benefits, and requiring a major expansion of higher education facilities to accommodate the resulting increase in college enrollments (Quattlebaum, 1960). In response to general sensitivity regarding the "threat of federal control," and setting a precedent for federal educational activity in the postwar years, the administration of both of these programs was delegated, as far as possible, to state agencies and the educational institutions themselves, with minimal supervision or control from the national government (Legislative Reference Service, 1961).

Particularly momentous for the future of government-university relations was the establishment during the war years of the federal grants and contracts system of support for university science research. Prior to World War II, little basic research in the sciences had been funded by the national government; academic scientists had related to federal agencies largely as short-term advisors on government in-house research programs. The advent of World War II, however, required an extensive mobilization of university scientists--through the allocation of federal grants--in the service of national war needs. Far from diminishing at the close of the war, the federal grant and contract system was expanded to support a broader range of scientific research, involving the university in new and increasingly diverse ways in the technological development of the nation and in the solution of national problems.

Although the responsibility of the national government for the general welfare and defense had legitimated federal support of certain higher education activities for more than 150 years, it was during World War II that the basic importance of higher education for the ongoing welfare and development of the nation became firmly established, and that broad federal support of academic research became a central and permanent feature of the American higher education system. The postwar years--marked by the appearance of Sputnik and the continuing Cold War, as well as by a growing awareness of domestic social problems in the United States--were to see a rapid expansion of government aid to higher education.

Between 1946 and 1967, federal funds allocated to colleges and universities for research and development increased from approximately $65.5 million to nearly $1.5

billion (Congressional Quarterly Service, 1967), making the government the source of three-quarters of all the funds expended for academic research in 1967 (Greenberg, 1967). In keeping with the prewar pattern of federal aid to education, these funds were directed toward the fulfillment of major national meeds--particularly toward defense, scientific and technological development, and health (Kerr, 1966).

The focus of federal interest on the uses of higher education for national development meant a concentration of support on specialized areas of training and research --largely within the physical sciences--with little effort to develop a more comprehensive higher education program. The government did not, that is, concern itself with the welfare of higher education as a whole; it did not have a specifically "educational mission." Rather, individual government agencies utilized the expertise and facilities of higher education institutions in the pursuit of their own programs, with little attention to the overall effect of piecemeal federal support on the functioning of the educational institutions involved or of the national higher education system.

This pattern of fragmented support and the absence of a more general higher education policy were perpetuated, in part, by the continuing fear of federal control of education which permeated the American system. During the 1950's, however, it became increasingly clear that strains and imbalances had been created within institutions of higher education--and in the higher education enterprise as a whole--by the concentration of federal funds on research and graduate training in the sciences (to the neglect of the social sciences and humanities as well as of undergraduate instruction) and by the tendency of federal agencies to grant funds to a limited number of universities already possessing the largest share of talent and the most extensive facilities. In 1962, 38 percent of all federal allocations for higher education research was concentrated in ten universities; 59 percent was concentrated in 25 universities (Ableson, 1964).

In addition, strains upon the internal cohesion of those universities receiving extensive federal funds resulted from the project system of research support, through which funds are granted directly to university scientists for the execution of specific research projects. This system tended to draw the primary loyalty of faculty members from their educational institutions to agencies providing research funds (Shannon, 1967). Large grants to individual faculty members provided these agencies leverage for demands upon the institutions housing their research projects, reducing administrative control over budgeting and related allocation of time and space. In Lapp's words (1965), this situation forced a university, in an extreme case, into the position of

> . . .a kind of switchboard intermediary between government agencies and the laboratory. Rather than exercising critical judgment on what fields of research should be supported, the university acts as a contract office. . .somewhat at the mercy of "eagerbeaver" staff members who demonstrate an ability to get contracts /pp. 21-22/.

Finally, stress was created within institutions of higher education by federal requirements for matching funds and cost sharing, by red tape connected with the processing of federal funds, and, significantly, by differences in policy among different funding agencies ($2.7 billion, 1967).

An awakening concern for the effects of fragmented, mission-oriented government support on the American university system led, during the 1950's, to some significant efforts on the part of the national government to respond more directly to educational problems. The first and one of the more important programs reflecting this concern was the College Housing Loan Program, passed in 1950, which provided for long-term, low-interest loans to universities and colleges (both public and private) for the construction of residential and other revenue-producing facilities (Legislative Reference Service, 1961).

The National Defense Education Act of 1958, stimulated in part by the launching of Sputnik a year earlier and an anxious reevaluation of science education in America, also reflected the federal concern for more balanced support of higher education institutions. Although the emphasis of this act was on science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages (in keeping with the earlier pattern of support in specified fields), its major purpose was the improvement of teaching in these areas as well as research. In addition, Title IV of the Act authorized 5,500 graduate fellowships to be awarded only to students attending new or expanding graduate programs (Congressional Quarterly Service, 1967). A $1 billion program, the Act constituted a massive federal commitment to higher education.

In 1963, the Higher Education Facilities Act authorized $1.2 billion for three years to provide federal grants and loans for constructing or improving higher education facilities, both graduate and undergraduate, public and private (Congress enacts, 1963). This Act has been described (Congressional Quarterly Service, 1967) as "the first broad education bill enacted in the postwar period that did not have national defense overtones /p. 9/." In addition to funds specified for facilities to be used for science, engineering, mathematics, and modern language courses, funds were made available without categorical limitation for other academic facilities as well.

Finally, the "revolutionary" Higher Education Act of 1965, which appropriated well over $600 million for 1966 and 1967 for a broad range of education programs, introduced some major changes in the pattern of federal aid to higher education (United States House of Representatives, 1967). Perhaps most importantly, federal scholarships for undergraduates were approved for the first time in American history. In addition, Title III of the Act authorized $55 million "to raise the academic quality of developing institutions (colleges which 'are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life')/Congressional Quarterly Service, 1967, p. 51/." And Title VI authorized matching federal funds for the improvement of undergraduate classroom instruction in science, humanities, arts, and education. As a result of this law and its subsequent amendments, as well as of such earlier legislation as the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 and the National Defense Education Act of 1958, federal aid for students rose from $7.5 million in 1950 to over $1 billion in 1967, while federal funds for college and university facilities rose from $5.7 million to $1.4 billion during those years (Congressional Quarterly Service, 1967).

FRAGMENTED RESPONSIBILITY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Concern for imbalances created within and among universities and colleges by mission-oriented federal support, along with a gradual broadening of the concept of "national needs" in relation to higher education, has led to a new sense of federal responsibility for supporting undergraduate instruction as well as graduate training and research, small or "developing" institutions as well as strong, well-established universities, and research in fields other than the physical and biomedical sciences and engineering. This new concern has not, however, served to integrate or coordinate the many federal educational programs administered by diverse agencies.

The situation has not changed fundamentally since 1931, when the National Advisory Committee on Education, appointed by President Herbert Hoover, reported that:

> . . .multitudinous Federal educational activities were scattered throughout the various Federal departments and independent agencies /and/ that the Federal Government had no inclusive and consistent public policy as to what it should do in the field of education /p. 34/.

This scattering of responsibility not only persisted through World War II, as government interest focused on university science research, but increased in the postwar period, when the wartime Office of Scientific Research and Development was dismantled and numerous federal agencies and departments took over and expanded the grant and contract system of research support.

A Legislative Reference Service Report (1961) indicates that "practically all of the departments and agencies of the Federal government are administering one or more educational activities at the Federal level [p. 7]." Babbidge (1964) estimated that 46 government agencies have programs important for higher education alone. Following are the education expenditures of 15 departments and agencies with estimated expenditures of more than $1 million during fiscal year 1967, according to a report by the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House of Representatives Committee on Education. (Figures are in millions of dollars.*)

Office of Education	$3,047**
Department of Defense	2,361
Office of Economic Opportunity	841
National Institutes of Health	790
Veterans' Administration	415
National Science Foundation	395
Department of Housing and Urban Development	347
Department of Labor	284
Department of the Interior	216
Public Health Service (excluding NIH)	193
Department of Agriculture	182
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	141
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration	121
Atomic Energy Commission	115
Economic assistance (funds appropriated to the President)	108

---

*Source: Special analysis G, Budget of the United States, fiscal year 1968.

**This figure represents estimated gross fiscal year 1967 administrative budget for education, training, and related programs.

Of the preceding agencies and departments listed, two--the U. S. Office of Education (USOE) and the National Science Foundation (NSF)--have had as a general mandate the the promotion of higher education activities.

The original tasks of the U. S. Office of Education, created in 1867, were:

> . . .to collect such statistics and facts as shall show the condition and progress of education, to diffuse such information as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems, and otherwise to promote the cause of education [*U. S. Government organization manual*, 1967, p. 362].

Functioning primarily through most of its history to gather and disseminate educational statistics, only in the 1960's has the U. S. Office of Education come to play a central role in the administration of federally funded educational programs.

The National Science Foundation, created in 1950, was authorized specifically to "develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences [National Science Foundation, 1965, pp. viii-ix]," a responsibility which involved it deeply in graduate education--predominantly in the areas of science, mathematics, and engineering--in university research, and in the building of campus research facilities.

Despite their growing affluence and their centrality in the administration of educational programs, however, the overall coordinative influence of the U. S. Office of Education and the National Science Foundation on federal aid to education has been, and remains, seriously limited. First of all, any efforts to centralize administrative responsibility for educational activities in one or two federal agencies have met with strong resistance from other powerful government departments having no desire to relinquish administrative control over educational programs central to their own missions.

In addition, however, the effectiveness of these organizations as coordinative bodies has been hampered by their relative political weakness within the government. The U. S. Office of Education, Munger and Fenno (1962) suggest, has been

> . . .in one sense a victim of its own success in insulating its position against political pressure. Like public school educators generally in the country, it has ordinarily tried to be nonpartisan and has isolated itself from the centers of political power [p. 84].

As a result, the Office of Education has suffered little criticism from Congress over the years, but it has not had adequate prestige and influence to make strong demands on the policy process. The National Science Foundation, on the other hand, as a young agency with a brief history of relations with Congress, has had few strong Congressional allies. Responsible to the President but placed outside the President's Executive Office, the NSF has lacked the necessary status to deal with overarching problems of federal science policy. It has also been dwarfed by other agencies, such as the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission, which play a major part in federal support of university research (Walsh, 1965). In 1957, NSF gave up all intentions of performing a formal coordinative role within government on the grounds that:

> It would be inappropriate to cast the Foundation in the role of critical coordinator of Federal agencies which support basic research. This would be impractical and unrealistic, especially in the case of large agencies because of their strongly mission-related programs [Kidd, 1959, p.21].

Finally, the coordinative role of the U. S. Office of Education, particularly, has been restrained by an ideological commitment to decentralized control of educational activities. Office of Education personnel have long feared the accusation that the Office was attempting to direct educational policy from within the government.

Bailey (1966) writes:

> Whatever the dangers of Federal control, and they exist, the historically- and constitutionally-conditioned reticence of USOE in this area had a crippling effect upon initiative and leadership. Reinforced in their modesty by state and local education offices, by educational professional associations, and by long-held theology of "local control," USOE officials were afraid of their own shadows --except in those limited areas of professional specialization in which their advice was "sought /p. 12/."

Thus, neither the U. S. Office of Education nor the National Science Foundation has had a major coordinative effect on scattered federal higher education programs.

Besides the many agencies and departments which participate in or support higher education activities, responsibility for higher education policy is further fragmented within the government by the number of Congressional committees through which educational legislation is channeled. No Congressional committees are devoted exclusively to education in either the House of Representatives or the Senate. Legislation concerning U. S. Office of Education and the National Science Foundation programs are handled in the Senate by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and in the House by the Committee on Education and Labor and the Science and Aeronautics Committee, respectively. Legislation concerning the Public Health Service (including the National Institutes of Health) and veterans' education is also channeled through the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, but it is handled in the House by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, respectively (Green, 1963). The House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee deal with the educational exchange programs of the State Department and the International Cooperation Administration; Agriculture Committees in both houses are responsible for land-grant college legislation; and the Money and Banking Committees handle the College Housing Loan Program (Menacker, 1966).

Nearly every committee of the Congress, Edith Green (1963) reports, has responsibility for legislation in some way related to educational programs. During the 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses, roughly half of the educational bills introduced in the Senate were handled by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, while "considerably less than half" of those introduced in the House were channeled through the Education and Labor Committee.

Finally, any discussion of the legislative processes pertaining to higher education must take into account the vital role of the President as chief legislator, or as the primary initiator of educational legislation. Generally speaking, the role of the Chief Executive as initiator in the legislative process had expanded greatly with the increasing complexity of policy problems in modern industrial society. Today, the President alone is in a position to make certain crucial decisions regarding legislative priorities and to provide the necessary leadership in Congressional lawmaking (Rossiter, 1960). Daniel Bell (1966) writes:

> It is no accident that, throughout the world, political power has passed increasingly to a strong executive, and that we have witnessed the decline of parliamentary, legislative, and Congressional government. Efforts to "mobilize" a society--for war or for social change--necessarily gives the executive an active and interventionist role, and reduces the importance of the legislature [p. 9].

It is the President, then, who bears a growing responsibility for articulating national goals and establishing priorities in the formulation of public policy. In addition, Bell argues, it is an integral part of the new "future-orientation" of American government that the administration has become strongly concerned with health, education, poverty, and urban affairs--all problem areas demanding a broad, forward-looking policy perspective.

In the area of higher education, the importance of the President as a source of major bills had increased dramatically in postwar years, culminating in the intense interest of both President Kennedy and President Johnson in federal aid to education at all levels. As education has come to assume a position of central importance in the domestic programs of these presidents, the Executive Office of the President has emerged as a critical locus of decision making regarding higher education, with key advisors in the White House, the Bureau of the Budget, and the President's Science Advisory Committee playing vital roles in the formulation of higher education policy.

Thus, responsibility for higher education programs rests in many hands within both the executive and legislative branches of the national government. The magnitude of government involvement in higher education, combined with the dispersion of authority for education programs, has created the need for many channels of information, advice, and representation between the government and the higher education system. The considerable decentralization and dispersion and the variety of higher education activities in the United States further contribute to this need.

MACHINERY OF ADVICE AND REPRESENTATION

Functions

Since its inception, the government of the United States has relied heavily on private citizens as well as on the occupants of government posts for adequate information and advice about the condition, needs, and interests of the nation. Private citizens participate regularly in federal decision-making processes--as individual consultants, and as members of public and private advisory bodies and interest groups. Their involvement in government activities serves five major functions, analytically though not empirically separable.

The information function. The government requires constant information from extragovernmental sources regarding the functioning of American social institutions. In addition, private citizens and organizations are in continual need of information regarding government programs affecting their interests and activities. Extragovernmental interest groups and governmental advisory bodies made up of private citizens act as important channels through which information is transmitted to the governed as well as to the governors in the American system.

The technical advisory function. Federal agencies and officials must rely extensively on the technical expertise of nongovernmental specialists in society to advise the policy process. (The archetypical specialist since World War II has been the physical scientist.)

The representative function. A crucial form of information required by federal policy makers is that concerning the existence, nature, and intensity of particular interests in the society. Mechanisms for representing social conflict, or the "special interests" of citizens to the government, have been an integral part of the American political system. Although the representation of particular interests to the government has been viewed by some critics as a threat to the "national interest" or the "general welfare," it is increasingly accepted in modern tical life as a necessary and positive aspect of the functioning of representative government in a pluralistic society.

Although this representative function is described here as analytically separable from the presentation to government of objective information or technical advice, it is important to stress the difficulty of distinguishing clearly between these functions empirically. Although the term *special interest* connotes political pressure, and the terms *objective information* and *technical advice* suggest disinterested neutrality, we would argue that the promotion of particular interests is inherent, in some degree, in all advisory activities--in the selection and presentation of information and in the delivery of technical advice. At best, advice-giving activities might be roughly ranked according to the amount and importance of the technical expertise or specialized knowledge which they are thought to involve.

The innovative function. Relatively few of the ideas behind federal programs, Yarmolinsky (1966) asserts, actually originate within the government itself. Rather, he suggests, the most significant source of important policy ideas is the academic community. Thus, private citizens (frequently members of the academic world) often contribute--as individual consultants or as members of advisory bodies--to innovation in federal programs and to the selection of new policy directions by federal officials.

The generation or influence of public sentiment. Inherent in each of the functions listed above is the possibility for private citizens to influence the federal policy process. Here it should be added that the creation or utilization of advisory groups composed of private citizens can also provide the government with a means of stimulating or influencing public sentiment on policy issues. The selective use of nongovernmental technical advisors to legitimate federal policy decisions is an obvious example. In addition, as Bell (1968) points out, citizen groups which "advise" or "inform" government agencies and officials may also "serve as a direct public relations device to call attention to certain issues and . . .generate public sentiment for support of various policies /pp. 295-297/." Bell also notes that pressure may be exerted by the government on the members of advisory bodies themselves in an effort to promote the support of particular policies.

Types of Connectors

As federal involvement in higher education has become more intense, the government has had a growing need to call upon academicians to advise in the educational policy process. Members of the academic community have also become increasingly eager to have their interests represented in Washington. As a consequence, a multiplicity of connective mechanisms have developed between American colleges and universities and the many government agencies, committees, and officials having important responsibility for policy in higher education.

In many cases, individual members of the academic world have played critical roles as liaisons between these separate spheres. In other cases, groups or organizations have been created--by the government or by the academic community--to serve as connectors between them. Some of these advisory-representative bodies have been temporary --concerned with specific or short-range policy problems --while others have been more comprehensive in their concerns, and more enduring. Some have been a part of the formal structure of government; others have been private bodies, having no formal connection with government bureaucracy. Some have been made up totally of members of the higher education enterprise; others have included business executives, foundation representatives, and government officials. All function as vital mechanisms of influence through which higher education and the federal government are linked.

Individual consultants or advisors from the educational community. Both the executive and legislative branches of the government rely on the advice and assistance of prominent individuals from the academic world in the development of legislation concerning higher education. High-prestige consultants from colleges and universities (such as Nobel Prize winners and university presidents) travel to Washington, D. C., regularly to confer with members of the White House staff or with various agency officials and to testify before committees of Congress.

Presidential task forces, advisory commissions, and conferences. Serving the Executive Office of the President at any given time are innumerable advisory bodies, composed (entirely or in part) of members of the higher education community, whose purpose is to contribute to the formulation of higher education policy. These advisory bodies range from temporary study groups to permanent units, such as the President's Science Advisory Committee, with fixed-term membership. Among the most temporary in nature are the advisory groups called together by the President for national conferences on vital policy issues, such as the White House Conferences on Education in 1955 and 1965. Such conferences are also the most visible, publicized mechanisms for obtaining the advice of academicians on policy problems, and they are an important means by which the President seeks to draw wide attention to national problems and to gain support for policy proposals.

The President's prerogative to call conferences, assemble advisory committees, and establish highly qualified advisors in top government posts affords him access to more extensive and expert information and advice than is ever available to Congress. The President's superior access to necessary information is, in fact, one of the major factors in the growing importance of his role in Congressional lawmaking.

Department and agency advisory committees, panals, and councils. Advisory committees, panals, and councils composed of academicians pervade the many agencies of government which administer significant education programs. The Study of the U. S. Office of Education (United States House of Representatives, 1967) states, for example, that

> . . .the great expansion in numbers and types of programs the Congress has entrusted to the Office and the obvious desirability and, indeed, necessity to call upon the educational community for advice and counsel has resulted in the authorization of 25 advisory committees /p. 55/.

Judging from the committee titles listed, at least eight of these 25 committees are concerned exclusively with programs in higher education administered by the U. S. Office of Education. On the basis of this study, the Subcommittee reported that

> . . .it is widely recognized that many outstanding educators and citizens, though not available on a full-time basis, do cooperate with the Office through the advisory committee system. The resulting range of specialized knowledge and expertise made available to the Office of Education could not possibly be brought to bear on the programs and plans of a single agency in any other way /p. 57/.

Associations. Private voluntary associations, whose membership consists entirely or in part of members of the higher education community, constitute a crucial form of linkage between their academic members and both the executive and legislative branches of government. The nature and variety of these organizations are the subjects of two succeeding chapters and need not concern us here. But it is appropriate, in this context, to emphasize the particular importance of associations as a source of information and advice for Congress.

Although Congress lacks the regular services of any large number of advisory bodies made up of highly qualified, nongovernmental experts, it does have access to two sources of information and advice from outside of government: individual experts, who can be called upon for short periods to testify before Congressional committees, and private organizations, which are able to provide expertise and speak for the various interests in American society. Thus, as the amount of educational legislation handled by Congress has increased, the importance of associations as connectors between higher education and the legislative branch has been considerably augmented.

Associations also build close, long-term relationships with federal departments and agencies, for whom they constitute crucial client groups. It is not uncommon, in fact, for association leaders to be recruited into federal agency posts, while associations frequently recruit top-level executives from government agencies and departments.

Washington representatives of individual colleges and universities. Many colleges and universities, in addition to their representation to government by higher education associations, have found it advantageous to establish their own institutional representatives in Washington, D. C. Clifford (1968) has reported that 20 such representatives have been established in Washington offices--some as full-time university employees and some as private entrepreneurs hired by educational institutions on a retainer basis--for the purpose of "keeping tabs on government programs, assisting in the procurement of federal funds, and trying to untangle administrative snarls in government-campus relations [p. 1334]." Also representing the needs and interests of individual institutions in the Capital, Clifford notes, are a number of commercial organizations which provide similar representative services.

Concerned largely with matters pertaining to university contracts and grants, such representatives deal almost exclusively with the executive agencies of government which administer educational programs. Of all the mechanisms of interaction between government and higher education described above, they qualify most closely as representatives of "special" educational interests--one end of an analytical continuum ranging from the promotion of narrow self-interests to the presentation of disinterested technical or expert advice on governmental policy in higher education.

National Associations

As formally organized structures outside the higher education system, advisory-representative bodies are an important part of the ancillary structure of higher education in the United States today. They provide a context for regular interaction among academicians from diverse institutional settings, and they create a two-way line of influence between the higher education community and the federal government.

The sheer number of the advisory-representative linkages which have emerged in Washington--inside and outside government--reflects both the many diverse activities and interests in higher education and the thoroughly fragmented federal responsibility for educational policy. Focused mostly on specific policy problems facing particular agencies and departments or on the concerns of narrow segments of the higher education community, few structures can claim a significant coordinative influence on government policy or on actual higher education activities.

Two types of advisory-representative bodies do, however, deal importantly with problems of cohesion: 1) those few within government having direct access to centers of governmental power (such as the President's Science Advisory

Committee), which tend to deal with, and exert considerable influence on, broad policy problems affecting federal support of higher education; and 2) those private, voluntary associations which seek to organize and represent a broad range of higher education interests in their relationship to the government. The national associations have the potential for playing a uniquely coordinative role in relations between the federal government and higher education because of their widely inclusive membership (few members of the academic community or institutions of higher education do not belong to at least one association), their relative permanence as ancillary structures on the national scene, their varied purposes as organizations, and their access to both executive and legislative branches of government. It is the nature of these ancillary organizations and their politicization which concerns us in the following pages.

III

National Associations and Higher Education

Studies of voluntary associations usually have taken one of three distinct approaches. Organizational analysis focuses on the internal structure and processes which characterize associations as an organizational type (Babchuk and Warriner, 1965). This approach views the social environment of the association as one influence on its organizational character and persons participating in association activities as "replaceable actors whose action is viewed as a function of organizational rather than personal processes /p. 135/."

Associations have also been studied in terms of their contribution to the lives of individuals in modern, industrial society. Here analysis focuses on associations as a setting for individual self-expression and satisfaction of special interests through collective activity. This sociopsychological perspective views associations as an antidote for the sense of alienation, isolation, and powerlessness suffered by individuals in a mass society. Associations are seen as providing an opportunity to identify with small groups, over which the individual has considerable potential influence, and supplying a form of psychological support no longer available through the extended family, the community, or the church (Babchuk and Edwards, 1965; Rose, 1967).

A broader perspective views associations and their contribution to society. Here attention focuses on associations as a type of "societal building block," with particular concern for their integrative role in modern social life (Babchuk and Warriner, 1965). Smelser (1963), describing the modernization process as "a contrapuntal interplay between differentiation (which is divisive of established society) and integration (which unites differentiated structures on a new basis)," counts associations among those integrative structures which, in the process of social development, "attempt with more or less success, to coordinate and solidify the social structure which the forces of differentiation threaten to fragment [pp. 41-43]."

This study will focus on the contribution of the association to society, although our broadest concern is not with the structure of the whole society, but with emerging patterns and processes in one institutional sphere--higher education. We will examine the way in which higher education associations, in their increasing involvement with the federal government, order diverse academic interests on the national level, thus serving to "coordinate and solidify" the national educational structure.

Before placing associations in this framework, however, it is necessary to identify them as clearly as possible as a form of organization which pervades American society. It is the purpose of this chapter to provide some generalizations on the nature, origins, and politicization of associations in modern industrial society, as background for a discussion of several different types of higher education associations and their diverse relationships to the federal government.

ASSOCIATIONS DEFINED

An association is defined by MacIver and Page (1949) as "a group organized for the pursuit of an interest or group of interests in common [p. 12]." Rose (1967) suggests, similarly, that "a voluntary association develops when a small group of people, finding they have a certain interest (or purpose) in common, agree to meet and act together in order to try to satisfy that interest or achieve that purpose /p. 213/." Associations, Barber (1950) emphasizes, always pursue specific interests, and,therefore, have some explicit purpose. And Goldhamer (1957) adds:

> . . .since the specialization of interests leads to a specialization of associational activities, the members of associations tend to associate with one another or pursue common activities only in respect to relatively narrow segments of their total life activities. This contrasts strongly with the type of total participation or association characteristic of such groups as the small community and the family /p. 593/.

Associations based on such specific common interests have been termed voluntary by sociologists, in contrast to those involuntary organizations into which persons are born, or those which they are compelled to join in order to survive in the society. As Rose (1967) points out, however:

> . . .in a secular order such as our modern, urban, democratic, free-enterprise society, it becomes in a sense, quite possible for anyone to withdraw from any involuntary association except a jailhouse. One can leave his family, his church, and even his state and the economic system /p. 216/.

The term voluntary does not, therefore, clearly distinguish a class of organizations. But by conventional usage, voluntary associations are generally differentiated from those organizations or groups into which an individual is born, as well as from those which he is physically compelled to join.

Associations are formally independent of the state, although some must register, and it is not uncommon for agencies of government to sponsor voluntary associations which serve specific agency missions (Sills, 1968). Thus, for example, the National Academy of Sciences--a private association--was created in 1863 by an Act of Congress (empowering it to "make its own organization, including its constitution, bylaws, and rules and regulations. . .") to provide the national government with expert science advice. (National Academy of Sciences and National Research Council, 1964).

According to the general definitions suggested above, most formal organizations in Western society can be accurately classified as voluntary associations. Associations are most often characterized, however, as organizations in which the majority of participants are part-time and nonsalaried, a feature which distinguishes them clearly from, for example, most business firms, foundations, or universities (Sills, 1968).

Nall (1967) further distinguishes between associations and the "basic organizational units" in the institutional spheres of which they are a part. "Business firms oriented to profit making and churches vested with religious authority are," he suggests, "the basic organizational units in the respective spheres of the economy and religion," and are thus "sociologically different from organizations ordinarily referred to as associations [p. 277]." To maintain this distinction in the economic sphere, however, it is necessary to eliminate from the category "association" all organizations which are "oriented to profit making," or which bring monetary gain to their members--including many which are frequently classified by sociologists as legitimate associations, such as the consumers' cooperative, many trade and labor unions, and some professional societies. In the religious sphere, on the other hand, it is difficult to draw any clear line between churches, "vested with religious authority," (in which most participants are part-time and nonsalaried) and religious associations. In defining his own sample for a survey of national associations Nall explains, "We arbitrarily excluded known churches, denominations, and sects as not conforming to our definition of an association [p. 277]."

In the economic sphere, then, the distinction between associations and "basic organizational units" seems overly restrictive; in the religious sphere, it remains ambiguous. In the educational sphere, however, the concept of "basic organizational unit" proves useful in setting off institutions of instruction (the basic organizations in the educational system) from educational voluntary associations, which perform no primary teaching function.

Truman (1955) describes the association as a dependent organization evolving from "tangent relations" among individuals interacting in various institutionalized groups. Truman explains:

> It is a group, a continuing pattern of interactions, that functions as a "bridge" between persons in two or more institutionalized groups or subdivisions thereof. The word "tangent" is appropriate because it suggests a set of relationships that are in a sense peripheral to those that define the central functions of the institutionalized group [pp. 40-41].

Thus, the relations among workers which constitute the basis for the labor union are peripheral or tangential to the hierarchical relations between worker and management which define the central functions of the business organization. And, in higher education, the relations among college professors which give rise, for example, to the learned society, are tangential to the professor-student-administrator relationships central to the teaching function of the college or university.

Finally, the voluntary association is democratic in formal organization, based on a written constitution which states the specific purposes of the organization and which prescribes the organizational structure through which these purposes will be pursued (Barber, 1950). Basic to this structure is a set of officials elected by the membership and responsible for carrying out the purposes of the organization. Although all association members typically may participate in the election of officials, there is a tendency within voluntary associations for control to become centralized in the hands of an active minority of officeholders. As Michels (1915) points out, these officeholders manage to retain power and characteristically develop purposes different from the original objectives of the organization and from those subscribed to by the majority of members.

Two Types of Voluntary Associations

An important distinction between two types of voluntary association--based upon differences in primary association objectives--has been suggested by Gordon and Babchuk (1959).

Expressive Associations.

In the "expressive" association, member participation is an end in itself; the interests and needs of members are satisfied directly through participation in association activities, such as social events, sports, the pursuit of hobbies or of scientific interests. Expressive associations do not, generally, attempt to influence the attitudes or behavior of nonassociational persons.

Instrumental Associations.

The "instrumental" or "social influence" association exists mainly to attain goals outside the association. Member participation is not an end in itself, but a means to achieving social change or maintaining some normative condition in the larger society. Thus, it is the explicit purpose of the instrumental association to influence nonmembers, rather than to provide immediate gratification to those who participate in association activities.

Some associations, Gordon and Babchuk add (1959), manifest purposefully both expressive and instrumental functions, and can meaningfully be designated as "instrumental-expressive" organizations. It should be generally recognized, however, that all instrumental associations perform some expressive function for their members:

> The apparent expressive character of any organization is consistent with the view in organization theory that activities and sentiments tend to develop above and beyond the requirements of the formal system. Hence, whatever the purpose of the organization, it will incorporate expressive characteristics for its maintenance and provide a framework for personal gratification /p. 26/.

And, conversely, most expressive associations engage either occasionally or secondarily in some form of instrumental activity--as when, for example, a hunting club seeks to influence legislation affecting the use of firearms. Such a club would not be classified as an instrumental association as long as its primary focus is on the immediate satisfaction of member interests and needs rather than on goals outside the organization (Babchuk and Edwards, 1965).

The Concept of Interest Group

Insofar as voluntary associations have been defined as groups organized around explicit common interests, any association can be referred to loosely as an interest group. The term interest group is generally used more narrowly, however, to refer to privately organized aggregations which attempt to exert influence either on other private groups in the society or on public policy (De Grazia, 1958). As used by Truman (1955), for example:

> . . ."interest group" refers to any group that, on the basis of one or more shared attitudes, makes certain claims upon other groups in the society for the establishment,

> maintenance or enhancement of forms of behavior that are implied by the shared attitudes /p. 33/.

If and when such a group "makes claims through or upon any of the institutions of government," Truman adds, "it becomes a political interest group /p. 37/."

An instrumental association is, then, from the viewpoint of the political scientist, an interest group. And many instrumental associations engage regularly and extensively in political interest group activities. In fact, the tendency for associations to make claims upon institutions of government is so great, Truman asserts, that some students of political interest group behavior have limited their study to the activities of groups that can be defined as associations. While such a definition of political interest group is clearly too narrow (corporations and educational institutions also make direct claims upon various levels of government and thus function significantly as political interest groups), it does draw attention to the importance of the association as a mechanism for the representation of interests to government.

CONDITIONS FOR THE EMERGENCE AND POLITICIZATION OF ASSOCIATIONS

In general, voluntary associations become more numerous and more important as societies gain in size and in technological and social complexity. "The most marked structural distinction between a primitive society and a civilized society," MacIver (1932) claims, "is the paucity of specific associations in the one and their multiplicity in the other /p. 147/." Noting the complexity of the distribution and form of associations in contemporary social life, Banton (1968) suggests that a general pattern can nevertheless be observed. He states:

> Among relatively small and technologically primitive groups, associations tend to be organized for recreation and the expression of distinctions of rank; in larger tribal societies they may exercise important governmental functions, and with an increasing division of labor they tend to be founded for the pursuit or defense of economic interests [p. 358].

Frequently, Banton notes, the formation of associations accompanies change in the form and organization of economic activity.

Broadly speaking, then, structural differentiation and the diversification of social and economic interests are conducive to the proliferation of associations and, particularly, to the development of associations of the instrumental type. In addition, however, the proliferation of associations seems to occur only in societies characterized by limited central authority, so that no single institution dominates all aspects of social, economic, and political life, or is expected to solve problems at every level of the social system (Rose, 1967; Glaser and Sills, 1966). Modern totalitarian governments, for example, tend to destroy associations (particularly social influence associations) or to dominate them, using them as a mechanism of control over the populace (Rose, 1954; Goldhamer, 1957). De Tocqueville saw an important connection between democratic political organization and the proliferation of voluntary associations in American society well over a century ago, and Glaser and Sills (1966) note a significant correlation in the United Kingdom, Scandinavia, and the Netherlands between limited central power and the development of important voluntary service and associations.

In a democratic society such as the United States one would expect that increasing structural complexity would be accompanied by a general proliferation of voluntary associations. Based upon a survey of the origins of 793 national associations, Nall (1967) gives evidence that the number of associations in the United States increased most notably during the period of greatest institutional differentiation--the 20th century. About 75 percent of the associations in his sample were founded between 1900 and the early 1960's. In this period, Nall notes, the economic sphere exhibited the "highest degree of differentiation and segregation of social roles and activities, and it is there that the greatest number and variety of national associations are organized /pp. 280-281/."

If a tradition of limited central authority and a rapid diversification of interests are among the conditions which have encouraged the development of voluntary associations in the United States, however, expanding federal government activity between 1900 and the present contributed importantly to the association movement. Especially during crises, the national government has had to look to private voluntary organizations for aid in mobilizing national resources. This explains, Truman (1955) suggests, why trade and labor associations proliferated most rapidly in the United States during war or economic depression. According to U. S. Department of Commerce and Labor estimates, the number of regional, national, and international trade associations in the U. S. grew from 240 in 1913 to about 2,000 in 1919, roughly the period of World War I (Herring, 1929). Truman observes that a similar increase occurred during the National Recovery Administration (NRA):

> A careful study in 1938 indicated that nearly 23 percent of the associations then extant had been formed in the years 1933-35. Many disbanded following the nullification of the National Industrial Recovery Act by the Supreme Court in 1935, but the period produced a permanent increase in number /p. 36/.

Among the major social conditions contributing to the proliferation of associations in the United States, then, are rapid structural differentiation, democratic social organization, and general expansion of the role of federal government. And each of these conditions can be seen, specifically, as contributing factors to the proliferation and importance of instrumental associations--associations geared toward influencing their social environment rather than toward providing consummatory activities for their members. Thus, shared concern for practical social problems and their solutions has provided the incentive for the organization of countless voluntary associations in this rapidly industrializing, urbanizing,and diversifying society in the 20th century.

In addition, however, increasing division of labor and the concomitant desire on the part of occupational groups to pursue or defend economic or occupational interests have led to the transformation of many expressive voluntary associations into highly active instrumental organizations. Writing of the development of the trade association movement in the United States, Truman (1955) asserts that "many of the early groups primarily engaged in 'innocuous and inconsequential social festivities' that indicate merely an increased rate of interaction /p. 78/." Industrialization, however, brought

> . . .virtually all of them /to assume/ the function of protecting the trade against the rigors of competition and the market, either directly through devices for controlling prices or indirectly through the application of various trading rules /p. 78/.

Gilb (1966) writes similarly of changes in the focus of early professional associations. Prior to the turn of the century, many of these associations:

> . . .existed purely for fellowship and the interchange of technical information. . . . Having other bases for their positions of eminence, the members apparently were sat-

> isfied to use their professional association (when they used it at all) primarily as a place for relaxation and informal communication with men of their own kind [p. 31].

Between 1890 and 1915, however, many members of the professions came to feel the need for "more comprehensive, cohesive, directed, vigorous, practical organizations [p. 39]" and reorganized their associations for the purpose of defending professionalism actively in the public sphere.

The gradual adoption of instrumental objectives, both Truman and Gilb make clear, has led to a strong tendency for trade and professional associations to make claims upon institutions of government. Recourse to government, Truman asserts, results from "the need of these groups for help in furthering their aims and from their closely related need of protection from the activities of economic and political rivals [p. 79]."

Consequently, both trade and professional associations have actively defended their interests against unfavorable regulation or legislation by the state and, at the same time, have promoted legislation which would serve to control the activities of rival groups. The professions have also extensively employed the sanctions of government to regulate the behavior of their own members, encouraging the establishment of state examining boards and strict licensing laws to screen recruits and to control the behavior of established members of the professions.

Diversification of social and economic interests has contributed, then, to the creation and development of instrumental associations in the United States and to their involvement with government. The emergence of national problems and the expansion of federal government responsibility in the 20th century has served, additionally, to draw the focus of associational interest group activity to the national level. Prior to the 1900's, when limited governmental controls over the economic enterprise were exercized primarily at the state and local levels, pressure from private groups for the promotion or regulation of economic activity was exerted primarily at these levels.

As business expanded across state lines, however, economic problems became increasingly national in scope. This development has led the federal government to assume new responsibility for the operation of the national economy and stimulated a concentration of trade and labor interest group activity in Washington, D. C. Similarly, the involvement of the federal government in policy areas affecting the professions in the postwar period (Medicare being a notable example) has resulted in new efforts on the part of professional associations to relate to federal agencies, as well as to state governments where responsibility for the regulation of professional practice has generally rested.

The widespread tendency in the 1960's for national associations to represent their interests to the federal government is demonstrated by Nall's (1967) finding that the principal officers of more than 40 percent of 793 national associations surveyed in 1962 have regular contact with federal government officials. The data from his survey, Nall asserts:

> . . .confirm the fact of widespread ties of more than an ephemeral nature linking a great many national associations (in all institutional spheres) with agencies of the federal government. There can be little doubt that linkages of this kind produce mutual influences and accommodations, and it would be reasonable to suppose that they indicate an important locus of associations' pressures on the government [p. 309].

THE EMERGENCE OF VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Those general social conditions which brought about the rapid proliferation of voluntary associations in American society during the 20th century have been critical factors, as well, in the proliferation of voluntary associations in the sphere of higher education. First of all, the growth and diversification of American higher education since the late 19th century have created a multiplicity of interests which seek expression in organizations outside the university.

Structural differentiation has occurred both among and within institutions of higher education. Reflecting the diverse educational needs of an industrializing, urbanizing society, educational structures have increasingly specialized along a variety of dimensions, including academic level (two-year and four-year colleges and graduate schools), subject matter (liberal arts colleges, broad universities, and technical institutes), religious affiliation (Catholic and Protestant colleges as well as secular institutions), and sources of control or support (private or public, state or local). And for each type of educational institution established in the United States, it would appear, at least one interinstitutional association has been formed to provide a forum for the consideration, and often the promotion, of common organizational and educational objectives.

Specialization within institutions of higher learning has also occurred along a number of dimensions. Perhaps the most profound structural division which has arisen within the university in the late 19th and early 20th centuries has been that between administration and faculty. Before the Civil War, only two or three administrative officers were required to operate most institutions of higher education, but since that time the growth in size and the broadening function of universities and colleges have brought about a gradual multiplication and diversification of administrative tasks. To the original managerial staff of president, treasurer, and part-time librarian, there were eventually added, as Rudolph (1965) recounts:

> . . .first a secretary of the faculty, then a registrar, and then in succession a vice-president, a dean, a dean of women, a chief business officer, an assistant dean, a dean of men, a director of admissions, and in time a corps of administrative assistants to the president who were in charge of anything and everything--public relations, church relations, civic relations, student relations, faculty relations /pp. 434-435/.

To students and faculty were thus added a third class of organizational participants, "the managers--the white collared, chief executive officers and their assistants /p. 438/," within whose ranks a continual diversification of role and function has contributed to the growing complexity of the university. As new offices have been established within the university bureaucracy, administrators have formed a vast array of associations with their counterparts in other institutions for the purpose of confronting educational problems and concerns from a shared organizational perspective.

Specialization of function within the university and the tendency to establish cosmopolitan ties along extra-university lines have been even more pronounced among university faculties, however. During the late 19th and early 20th centuries, a shift from emphasis on the teaching role of the professor to emphasis on research and publication gave scientific and scholarly specialization a new impetus and a new impact on university structure. As disciplinary departments and divisions, as well as research centers, multiplied within institutions of higher education, learned societies grew up outside the institutions to provide channels of interuniversity communication among research specialists and to supply them, in particular, with journals through which to publish. Rudolph (1965) writes:

> The older learned societies which had served a more general purpose--the American Philosophical Society of 1743, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences of 1780, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science of 1848 which testified to the early attraction of science--were now joined by societies that represented the fragmentation of learning and that gave scholars a means of pooling their energies and their discoveries p. 406 .

Thus, as Table 1 indicates, a significant proliferation of higher education associations accompanied the turn of the century. Of the 399 national higher education associations for which founding dates are given in the Encyclopedia of associations (1968), only 13 (about 3%) were in existence prior to 1880. In the next 20 years,32 new associations were formed, and in the first two decades of the 20th century,70 more organizations were created. The total number in existence by 1920 was 115, or nearly 29 percent of the total number for 1966. This increase in the rate of emergence of national associations clearly reflects the growth and structural change taking place in American higher education.

It is striking to note that only 49 percent of 399 national higher education associations that were in existence in 1966 had been founded by 1940; over half of these 399 organizations were established, then, during World War II and the postwar period. In contrast to this figure, Nall (1967) reports that of 758 national associations (in all institutional spheres) surveyed by him in 1962, nearly 80 percent were founded prior to 1940, with the greatest increase in number

Table 1

Number and Percentage of National Higher Education Associations by Period in Which Founded

Period	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1960-66	55	13.9	100.0
1940-59	148	37.1	86.1
1920-39	81	20.3	49.0
1900-19	70	17.5	28.7
1880-99	32	8.0	11.2
1860-79	6	1.5	3.2
1840-59	4	1.0	1.7
1820-39	1	0.2	0.7
1800-19	0	0.0	0.5
Pre-1800	2	0.5	0.5
Total	399*	100.0	

---

*The number of higher education associations for which dates of origin are available in the Encyclopedia of associations (1968). Founding dates are not listed for 10 additional higher education associations identified. Altogether, 409 national associations meet the following criteria:

1) They are associations in which membership is made up entirely or in significant part of individual

occurring between 1900 and 1920. (Of the 758 associations listed by Nall, 24.3% were founded in 1900 or earlier; 30.2% between 1900 and 1920; 25.2% between 1920 and 1940; and 20.3% in 1940 or later.) Although in Nall's data the pattern of proliferation differs from sphere to sphere, the emergence of economic associations (the largest group in his sample) follows roughly the pattern for the total sample: of 322 economic associations, nearly 77 percent were founded before 1940, with the greatest increase in number between 1900 and 1940 (28% between 1900 and 1920 and 30.7% between 1920 and 1940).

---

members of the academic community and/or associations similarly made up of academic individuals or institutions. Where the members of these associations are individuals, the majority of the members are part-time and nonsalaried. Where the members are primarily organizations, the number of full-time, paid association officers is, in some instances, greater than the number of organizational members.

2) Their primary interests or purposes relate closely to higher education activities: instruction, research, or the administration of higher education institutions. Here an ambiguity lies in the distinction between "higher education" associations, on the one hand, and "professional" associations, concerned primarily with professional practice, on the other. Associations having practitioners among their members are included here if it appears that they represent the "pure disciplines" (originating from a research rather than a practice base) and that they are heavily influenced, in their organizational objectives, by the research focus of their academic members. Excluded from the "higher education" category (despite their academic members) are such practice-oriented organizations as the American Medical Association and the American Bar Association.

See Appendix A for a complete list of the national higher education associations identified from the Encyclopedia of associations.

2

To account for the differential patterns of proliferation of national voluntary associations within the higher education and economic spheres, the emergence of national problems and the expansion of federal government activity in the 20th century must be considered in relation to structural change in these spheres. During the early part of the century, industrialization was responsible for rapid structural differentiation in the economy and for the emergence of a nationwide economic system. Before World War I, the need for national promotion and control of commercial activity involved the federal government significantly in the economic system, but the war served to itensify the economic changes already taking place in the United States--the expansion, diversification, nationalization, and government promotion and regulation of business enterprise. These developments help to account for the proliferation of national economic associations during the early years of the century as well as for the early tendency of these associations to relate closely to the national government.

Higher education, on the other hand, was still in the early stages of structural diversification at the beginning of World War I, and it remained highly decentralized in its sources of control and support; it was not yet perceived as a vital national resource requiring extensive government-sponsored mobilization. World War I, therefore, had a lesser impact on the structure of higher education than on the structure of the national economy.

Nevertheless, during the war years, a number of higher education voluntary associations were created with direct government encouragement to aid in organizing university resources in the service of national needs. The American Council on Education, the Social Science Research Council, and the National Research Council were all formed in 1918 to provide a link between higher education and the national government.

The Depression years, as well, saw a significant multiplication of higher education associations, many of which contributed directly to the national recovery effort. But it was World War II which profoundly affected the structure of American higher education and which stimulated a massive proliferation of academic voluntary organizations.

During and following World War II, government expenditures on science research and other extensive programs, including the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, contributed to a major expansion of the higher education enterprise and to an accelerated diversification and specialization of activities and interests within the academic community. This acceleration accounts at least in part for the rapid increase in the number of higher education associations following 1940.

In addition, however, recognition of the new centrality of higher education to the national welfare focused the attention of academicians (as well as government officials) more firmly than ever before on nationwide educational problems and needs, thus stimulating the establishment of organizations specifically charged with the coordination of national higher education activities and programs. Finally, as Chapter 1 emphasizes, the great intensity of federal government involvement in the academic enterprise during World War II and the postwar years created the need for new structures to represent higher education in Washington, D. C.

The importance of the federal impact on higher education as a stimulus to the proliferation and political involvement of associations since World War II is clearly indicated by the strong concentration of academic association headquarters in Washington, D. C. Of 409 national higher education associations identified from the Encyclopedia of associations (1968), 102 (or 25%) had central or major office headquarters in the Capital in 1966. The only other city having a significant concentration of association offices in that year was New York, with 64 (15.6%), while Philadelphia and Chicago were the locations of

16 and 11 association offices, respectively (6.6% combined). Although the location of an association office in Washington, D. C., cannot be assumed to indicate a direct relationship with the federal government in every instance, nevertheless it can be interpreted as an indication of some form of instrumental (or interest group) activity on the part of the association officers--activity which involves many of them with agencies and officials of the government.

A number of higher education associations with headquarters outside Washington deal occasionally--or even regularly--with the government, as well. Of 792 national associations surveyed by Nall (1967), only 24.2 percent have their headquarters in Washington. However, more than 40 percent report they are in "regular contact" with federal officials.

In the years since 1940, then, national higher education associations have expanded dramatically in number and have become increasingly instrumental in focus. The instrumentalization process has occurred not only through the creation of new organizations to promote the interests of academicians on the national scene but also through the adaptation and elaboration of older structures--many of them once primarily expressive in orientation--to meet developing needs. Of 91 higher education associations whose offices were located in Washington in 1966, 54 associations (about 59%) had established their Capital offices since 1956. Of these 54 associations, 21 were new organizations setting up offices for the first time. The remaining 33 associations, however, previously had offices in other locations and moved their headquarters to Washington (or established additional offices there) between 1956 and 1966. The present concentration of association offices in Washington reflects, consequently, not only the multiplication of higher education associations in recent years but also a tendency for voluntary organizations previously centered elsewhere to establish offices in the Capital.

POLITICIZATION OF ASSOCIATIONS AND THE INTEGRATION FUNCTION

The adoption or development of instrumental purposes has important consequences for the integrative function which these national higher education associations perform within the higher education system. Studies of associations tend to share an implicit, if not explicit, assumption that these voluntary organizations play an integrative role in modern social life. This role can usefully be conceptualized, Babchuk and Edwards (1965) suggest, in both sociological and sociopsychological terms. From a sociopsychological perspective, voluntary associations can be seen as a source of "affectual support" for their members and as social structures contributing to the integration of the personality system. Expressive associations, which are geared toward the immediate gratification of member interests, can be thought to be integrative primarily at this psychological level. Instrumental associations which seek to affect their social environment, can be thought to be integrative primarily for the social system.

The view of associations as mechanisms of cohesion in modern social life is widely held by contemporary social theorists. Rose (1967), for example, writes that

> . . .most voluntary associations act to tie society together and to minimize the disintegrating effects of conflict. While they are themselves sometimes conflict groups, associations practically never carry their conflicts to the extreme of tearing the society asunder /p. 250/.

This has not always been the prevalent assumption about associational interest groups, however. Reflecting on the premises which have, in the recent past, guided the study of interest groups by political scientists, Eldersveld (1958) remarks:

"We have operated usually with a 'conflictual' theory, that interest groups pit group against group and thereby exacerbate social relationships and promote tension /p. 188/." It has been a common criticism of political interest groups, particularly, that their commitment to limited, private interests places them in direct opposition to the public interest and to national unity.

A change in the view of interest groups as a disintegrative force has resulted, however, from the recent tendency in social science to emphasize the potentially unifying effects of conflict. Simmel (1955) wrote as far back as 1908 that

> . . .a certain amount of discord, inner divergence and outer controversy, is organically tied up with the very elements that ultimately hold the group together; it cannot be separated from the unity of the sociological /pp. 17-18/.

Reflecting Simmel's view today, Coser (1956) asserts:

> Conflict as well as cooperation has social functions. Far from being necessarily dysfunctional, a certain degree of conflict is an essential element in group formation and the persistence of group life /p. 31/.

In addition to the growing tendency among social theorists to accept conflict as an essential element of any social system, there has been increasing recognition of an important source of constraint on the expression of conflict among interest groups. Associations are prevented from destroying each other, and from seriously jeopardizing the social order, by the tendency for their memberships to overlap. Since associations involve persons only with respect to narrow segments of their total interests and activities, most individuals do not identify entirely with any one group in which they participate; rather, the diversity of interests held by members of a complex, urban society tends to involve each of them in a variety of organizations or groupings. As a result, Truman (1955) points out:

> The leaders of a Parent-Teacher Association must take some account of the fact that their proposals must be acceptable to members who also belong to the local taxpayers' league, to the local chamber of commerce, and to the Catholic Church /p. 509/.

The constraints thus placed on the activities of any single organization reduce the danger, for the social system, of competition among a multiplicity of interest groups.

Lipset (1960) sees multiple interest groups with overlapping memberships as a source of particular stability and cohesion in a democratic social system:

> The available evidence suggests that the chances for a stable democracy are enhanced to the extent that groups and individuals have a number of crosscutting, politically relevant affiliations. To the degree that a significant portion of the population is pulled among conflicting forces, its members have an interest in reducing the intensity of political conflict /pp. 88-89/.

And Coser (1956) writes:

> The multiple group affiliations of individuals make for a multiplicity of conflicts criss-crossing society. Such segmental participation, then, can result in a kind of balancing mechanism, preventing deep cleavages along one axis /pp. 78-79/.

Evaluating the integrative function of competing interest groups in a democratic society, Bayles (1960) concludes:

> Pressure groups are not a handicap to a unity seen as the coordination of diverse and frequently conflicting interests. With that form of unity which is seen as the identity of interests, interest group organization does interfere. . . [But] the unity on which a free society is based must be the product of constant tension and balance of forces. Its unity is based on the temporary and shifting results of voluntary, piecemeal resolution of conflicts, rather than any overriding identity of belief [p. 59].

The emergence and instrumentalization of higher education associations in Washington, D. C., must be viewed, then, as the mobilization of many varied and potentially conflicting academic interests on the national scene. The concentration of so many association offices in a single urban center and, particularly, the efforts of many of these organizations to represent their diverse interests to government have heightened competition and conflict among academic interests on the national level. An important constraint on this rivalry, however, has been the considerable overlap in membership among those higher education organizations which are most active as national interest groups. But more important, a strong influence on intergroup relations among academic associations in Washington has been exerted by the federal government itself.

This influence has been noted by Hall (1965) in relation to trade associations seeking to participate in policy formulation in the Capital. Hall argues that the government, besieged by representatives of the multiple interests which make up each institutional sphere, has increasingly pressed interest groups to reach agreement among themselves on policy issues affecting them mutually and to approach federal agencies and Congress with policy recommendations reflecting, wherever possible, a united front. Executives of national business associations have reported, for example, that both Congress and the Executive tend to favor bills which can be said to represent consensus among potentially conflicting interests within an industry, so that passage of such bills will be unlikely to offend any of the important groups whose interests they affect. Desire for sustained and effective participation in the shaping of federal policy thus provides strong incentive for associations dealing with the government to engage in intergroup bargaining, negotiation, and alliance, and to go to the government with broadly supported policy proposals.

In this same way, the government has become an important source of pressure on academic associations to concert action in Washington among diverse groups and interests. The cohesive effect of this pressure on interorganizational relations among higher education associations is the subject of Chapter 6.

Quite apart from their interorganizational relations, however, higher education associations in Washington focus academic concern on national educational interests and needs, define them, and give them articulation. Such organizations, suggests a report of the American Political Science Association (1950), tend to "counteract and offset local interests; they are a nationalizing influence. Indeed, the proliferation of interest groups has been one of the factors in the rise of national issues /p. 20/" in the United States.

As active interest groups, then, national higher education associations tie members of the academic community into a wider social context by informing them of events in the larger society which affect their interests and interpreting these events for them, by defining policy views consistent with association purposes, and by giving their members a form of influence on national decision-making processes. In these important ways, academic associations in Washington contribute to the emergence of a national higher education system.

But instrumental associations contribute, as well, to the social organization of activities which, because of their technical or political nature, are not regulated directly by the state. We have referred, for example, to the responsibility assumed by professional associations for the establishment and maintenance of uniform standards of professional practice through state law and codes of ethical conduct. Similarly, national higher education associations have assumed responsibility for the accreditation of institutions and programs of higher education and for many other efforts to standardize procedure across a highly diverse and decentralized educational system.

The following chapters, however, focus upon only one aspect of the instrumental activity of academic associations--their involvement with the federal government, and the special implications of this involvement for the achievement of national order and coordination among higher education interests and activities. The nature and degree of politicization of higher education associations in Washington, D. C., vary significantly with the purposes and interests around which these groups are organized. Chapter 4 suggests a typology of higher education associations which will point up differences in the extent to which each type of organization has been used by members of the academic community to represent their interests to government, indicating what effects these differences have on the structure of intergroup relations among academic associations in Washington.

IV

Types of Higher Education Associations and Federal Government Relations

Creating a typology of higher education associations is hazardous, especially since we agree with Babbidge and Rosenzweig (1962) that these associations are "so varied, overlapping, and uneven in size. . .that they defy generalization [p. 92]." Tremendous diversity among higher education voluntary organizations--in size, nature of membership, degree of instrumental activity, and in focus of that activity--insures that a typology emphasizing similarities among organizations on one dimension will obscure considerable differences on others. However, a typology provides useful categories for explaining variation in one aspect of association behavior--namely, the degree of involvement of different association types with the federal government.

The typology presented here groups associations according to primary interests and purposes. Of course, basic interests of various association types occasionally overlap, since all are concerned with some aspect of higher education. However, emphasis on differences in organizational focus is useful in analyzing association relations with federal agencies and Congress. We will distinguish among associations which are oriented primarily toward 1) advancing educational institutions, 2) developing academic disciplines, 3) enhancing professional status of academic faculties, and 4) performing a number of special tasks within higher education.

The following examples point up some central characteristics of each association type and show (in some cases) significant variation within these types. Since history determines the nature and scope of associational interests to some extent, and the interests are expressed in structure and growth, we cannot avoid including some details of the structure of these organizations and the emergence over time of their differentiating functions and purposes.

(1) INSTITUTIONALLY TIED ASSOCIATIONS

Institutionally tied associations are primarily concerned with the development of higher education policies and programs from the perspective of educators (typically administrators) formally responsible for the viability and advancement of their educational institutions. Membership of these associations is composed predominantly of higher education institutions or segments of these institutions (although members of some institutionally tied associations also include other higher education associations), represented to the association, in most cases, by administrators. In a few instances, the members are, or include, individual administrators; but these individuals usually participate as representatives of the institutions with which they are affiliated and within which their status as academicians is defined (e.g., president, chancellor, or dean). For individuals, then, participation in association activities ordinarily is contingent upon affiliation with an institution of higher education rather than upon independent professional qualifications, such as the attainment of an academic degree.

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC)

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges is the oldest of the institutionally tied associations in the higher education system; it was established (as the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations) in 1887 (National Association of State Universities, 1968). This national organization of higher education institutions was a direct outgrowth of the Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862, through which the federal government provided land to each state for the establishment or support of colleges emphasizing instruction in "agriculture and the mechanic arts." The Land-Grant Act, Thackrey (1965) writes, soon

> . . .necessitated a series of meetings of those institutions charged with carrying out common policies in the programs in agriculture, engineering, and national defense. . .and. . .required an organizational structure to deal with the Federal Government /p. 238/.

By 1881, representatives of the land-grant schools had begun to meed informally in Washington, D. C., to discuss the common needs, problems, and objectives of the institutional recipients of federal grants under the Morrill Act; and in the mid-1880's, steps were taken to formalize this exchange.

As a result of the gradual realization that land-grant institutions had interests and needs in common with other state universities, the original association of land-grant colleges subsequently combined membership with the National Association of State Universities (founded in 1895) and the State Universities Association (founded in 1918), and the organization assumed its present name and composition in 1963. Members of the Association now include 69 land-grant schools (located in each state and in Puerto Rico and 31 state universities which have not been recipients of federal land under the Morrill Act.

Representatives to the Association are the chief executives of member colleges and universities (presidents, chancellors, and provosts), as well as other chief administrators responsible for major areas of institutional organization and service--such as fiscal matters or research policy. The major policy making bodies of the Association, the Senate and Executive Committee, however, are composed primarily of chief executives of member institutions, and elected officers of the Association have consistently been college presidents or chancellors. A predominance of chief executives in the leadership of the NASULGC (and of other institutionally tied associations having whole institutions as members) has led to the tendency, especially among association staff members in Washington, D. C., to refer to these organizations as "presidents' clubs."

The Association's five Councils and seven Commissions reflect the administrative structure of the university. They are: the Council of Presidents, the Council for Academic Affairs (composed of chief administrative officers responsible for the academic programs of their respective institutions), the Council for Business Affairs (composed of administrators responsible for fiscal matters), the Commission on Graduate Education, the Commission on Education for Engineering, and the Commission on Education for the Teaching Profession.

The functions performed by the NASULGC's national office in Washington (established in 1947) indicates the nature and focus of the Association's interest group activity on the national level. The Association's Office of Institutional Research, for example, gathers and disseminates to the public information on higher education in the United States in an effort to "focus attention on the needs of public higher education for greater support from public and private sources /National Association of State Universities, 1968, p. 8/." The Washington office staff also provides information on Association policies to federal agencies and officials, and it

> . . .assists in arranging for testimony regarding these policies before appropriate Congressional committees by representatives of the Association; and serves as a means of communication among member institutions and other organizations, institutions, and agencies--public and private /p. 8/.

In its frequent dealings with the federal government, and in its role as a vehicle for communication between its member institutions and other national organizations, the Association's Washington office is, in fact, a prototype for the offices of many younger institutionally tied associations more recently established in the Capital. Its broad range of consultative and representational activities will concern us particularly in Chapter 6.

A clear indication of the serious effort on the part of the NASULGC to exert influence on the formulation of federal higher education policy is provided by a statement entitled *Recommendations for national action affecting higher education*, which was issued jointly in 1967 by the NASULGC and the Association of State Colleges and Universities (renamed in 1968 the American Association of State Colleges and Universities). Among a great many recommendations for national action, the two associations stressed the importance of "increased support for our *colleges and universities*, through public and private channels, to enable them to keep down the charges to students and their families [pp. 8-9]." Regarding the specific nature of this financial aid, the Associations urged "a substantial program of *institutional* grants" to complement the expansion of support of academic research through federal project grants and contracts. Such institutional support is necessary, the statement asserts,

> . . .to protect the essential integrity of colleges and universities *as such*, and to enable additional institutions to develop the capacity to contribute more effectively to the achievement of national goals and objectives [p. 13].

The Associations also registered their strenuous objection to the "mandatory cost-sharing concept" (according to which higher education institutions must contribute some funds of their own to meet the costs of federally financed academic research) which had been included in recent legislation regarding federal research grants.

In these, as in other of their joint recommendations for national action, the two Associations made clear their primary commitment to the development of educational institutions as viable (reasonably integrated) organizations rather than to the promotion or development of any single program or type of activity carried on within those institutions.

In addition to its frequent dealings with Congress, the NASULGC carries on working relationships with a broad range of government agencies, including the U. S. Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, and the Departments of Agriculture and Defense. Two joint committees with the Department of Agriculture, the Committee on Education for Government Service and the Committee to Study Cooperative Extension Service, reflect a long-standing cooperative effort to develop agricultural education in American land-grant colleges and universities.

The Council of Graduate Schools in the United States (CGS)

Although a number of distinct administrative units within the modern institution of higher education (departments, schools, and colleges) are represented nationally on the councils and commissions of associations, such as the NASULGC, there has been a growing tendency in recent years for administrative segments of universities and colleges to organize independently on the national level, in order to establish a broader representative base and to gain greater autonomy in the consideration of issues and problems confronting their members. Thus, the Association of Graduate Schools (a subunit of the Association of American Universities) initiated efforts in 1960 to establish a Council of American Graduate Schools, an organization which would be ". . .independent of organizations presently existing and nationally representative, including as members a large majority of the institutions presently granting doctoral degrees /Council of Graduate Schools, 1962, p. 2/." Among the younger of the institutionally tied associations on the national scene, the CGS came into formal existence in March 1961, with the adoption of a constitution and the election of officers; its Washington office was established in February of 1962 (Arlt, 1962).

The primary purpose of the Council, as stated in Article 2 of the *Constitution of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States* (1965) is "the improvement and advancement of graduate education." Article 2 continues:

> The purview of the Council includes all matters germane to this purpose. The Council shall act to examine needs, ascertain best practices and procedures, and render assistance as indicated; it may initiate research for the furthering of the purpose. It shall provide a forum for the consideration of problems and solutions, and in meetings, conferences, and publications shall define needs and seek means of satisfying them in the best interests of graduate education throughout the country. In this function the Council may act in accordance with the needs of the times and particular situations to disseminate to the public, to institutions, to foundations, to the Federal, State and local governments, and other groups whose interest or support is deemed of concern, information relating to the needs of graduate education and the best manner of satisfying them.

Membership in the CGS is limited to accredited institutions which have conferred a total of 40 graduate (masters and/or doctoral) degrees in at least three separate disciplines during the three-year period prior to their application to the Council (Council of Graduate Schools, 1962). Member institutions numbered 248 in 1968 (*Encyclopedia of associations*, 1968). Representatives of these institutions to the Council are, primarily, the deans of their graduate departments, schools, or divisions.

A five-point program was adopted by the CGS in 1962. As described by the Council's president, Gustave Arlt (1962), the program illustrates the concerns which have characterized this voluntary organization:

Point 1: "*The Council will develop criteria for self-evaluation of graduate schools.*" While most of the members of the CGS are opposed to the idea of evaluating graduate schools separately from the larger institutions of which they are a part, the Council faces an increasing tendency on the part of supporting agencies--the federal government and foundations--to evaluate graduate programs separately according to their own criteria. Arlt states:

> Whether or not such evaluations are valid, they do not necessarily represent the standards which graduate schools would set for themselves. It therefore becomes necessary for the Council, on the basis of its collective experience and wisdom, to develop and establish a set of clear and objective criteria for the measurement of graduate work. . .to establish a set of objective standards against which every school can measure its own quality and plan its own improvement [p. 7].

Point 2: "*The council will develop criteria for the establishment of new Ph.D. programs.*" In response to the tremendously rapid growth of new doctoral programs in institutions which have previously granted only bachelor's or master's degrees, the Council has attempted to advise and help expanding institutions to maintain appropriate standards of evaluation for new programs.

Point 3: "*The Council will suggest means for reducing the duration of doctoral study.*" Protesting that doctoral study in the United States is unnecessarily prolonged, the Council has suggested a model time schedule for graduate study and has discouraged extensive employment of graduate assistants.

Point 4: "The Council will act to promote improvement and, as far as possible, standardization of student personnel records." The Council has established a list of vital statistics to be recorded on permanent record cards for graduate students and has recommended a model format for transcripts.

Point 5: And finally, "The Council will intensify its campaign in favor of substantial Federal aid to the humanities." The Council has attempted to counteract the imbalance created in graduate education by extensive federal support of science and technology "while the spiritual and esthetic values of the humanities and the arts are being lost [p. 8]." An active campaign on the part of the CGS was, in fact, a major factor in bringing about the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

One of the original functions of the CGS, as envisioned by its founders, was to "provide a channel for bringing to bear, in concentrated and effective fashion, the wisdom and experience of all those most knowledgeable about graduate education upon government agencies and foundations interested in questions affecting the graduate schools [p. 2]." President Arlt announced in 1962 that already

> . . .in the relatively brief period of its existence, the Council [had] established good working relations with the United States Office of Education, with the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, various agencies of the Department of Defense, and others [p. 5].

In addition to these relations with agencies and departments of government, the Council had also formed, by 1965, a Liaison Committee with the Association of American Colleges and a Liason Committee with the Educational Testing Service, as well as more informal ties (see Chapter 6) with other institutionally tied associations centered in Washington.

As a vehicle for voluntary consultation and cooperation among formally autonomous educational institutions, the Council of Graduate Schools is inevitably somewhat limited in its effectiveness by the lesser authority of graduate deans than of college and university presidents in the administration of higher education. Where the recommendations of the Council involve changes in university policy, these changes must be negotiated with the chief executives of the institutions involved. Where the CGS recommendations touch upon the interests of the academic disciplines--as they do, for example, in the case of establishing standards for the accreditation of graduate programs and in the case of the Council's efforts to reduce the duration of doctoral programs--graduate deans must meet opposition from powerful faculty groups from their own position of limited administrative authority. The voluntary cooperation of graduate deans on the national level does not, therefore, assure the cooperation of the institutions they represent.

The American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy (AACP)

The American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy was established in 1900 for the purpose, as stated in its Constitution, of promoting pharmaceutical education and research. As an association concerned with promoting education and research in a particular discipline, the AACP represents a marginal example of an institutionally tied higher education association (sharing some features of the discipline-oriented association as this type is defined below). It is included in the institutionally tied category, nevertheless, because of its primary focus upon the development of colleges of pharmacy as educational organizations (i.e., as administrative subunits of higher education institutions). The AACP, like a number of other institutionally tied associations (but in contrast to the two described above) is committed to the development of a university program as a means of advancing a specific professional field.

The membership of the AACP is made up of colleges of pharmacy which are accredited by the American Council on Pharmaceutical Education, and which meet other AACP criteria relating to size of faculty, extensiveness of curriculum, and so on, as stated in the Association's bylaws (1964, Article 1). Member institutions are represented at Association meetings by faculty-elected delegates, who must be "directly connected with the institution as members of its teaching staff [Article 12]." Thus, while participants in Association affairs are faculty members rather than academic administrators (in contrast to most institutionally tied associations), these faculty members attend association meetings as elected representatives of institutions rather than by sole virtue of their faculty status or disciplinary affiliation.

The primary concern of the AACP with the development of institutional programs is reflected in its standing and continuing committees, which include the Committee on Educational Policies, the Committee on Curriculum, the Joint Committee on Pharmacy College Libraries, the Committee on Future Enrollment Problems, the Committee on Graduate Programs, and the Committee on Recruitment Aids. At the same time, the strong ties of this Association with the broader (largely nonacademic) professional field of pharmacy are indicated by its practice of sending delegates or representatives to the American Pharmaceutical Association, the National Drug Trade Conference, the National Association of Retail Druggists, and the National Advisory Commission on Careers in Pharmacy, as well as to the educationally oriented American Council on Pharmaceutical Education, and the Association of American Medical Colleges.

The AACP differs from the NASULGC and the CGS in belonging to the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Like these other two institutionally tied associations, however, the AACP also belongs to the American Council on Education (ACE).

The central office of the AACP moved to Washington in 1961, as a result of increased government activity in the area of health education, to allow the Executive Secretary of the Association to follow closely all legislation relevant to the interests of the AACP. It has been a major responsibility of the Executive Secretary, since that move, to monitor legislation related to health education and research, to inform Association members and other pharmacy associations of legislative action relevant to their interests, to testify before Congressional committees regarding such legislation, and to arrange for other AACP members to testify. Where testimony before Congress is planned, the AACP statement is frequently submitted to other pharmacy associations for their prior approval.

The Executive Secretary also acts as consultant to the Commission on Federal Relations of the ACE. In addition, the AACP has recently created a Special Committee on Pharmaceutical Science and the National Institutes of Health to represent the Association in relations with the Public Health Service (Bliven, 1966).

The American Council on Education (ACE)

The American Council on Education came into existence in 1918 under the temporary name of the Emergency Council on Education. Its founding members were fourteen national education associations seeking (with direct encouragement from the federal government) to assist with the coordination of higher education resources to meet national war needs. As it became apparent to these original members that the need for such a coordinative body would persist into the postwar period, its present name was adopted and its range of concerns broadened (American Council on Education, undated, a). The 1966 Annual Report of the ACE states that the basic purpose of the Council--one which has continued to cast it in the role of liaison between higher education and the government--is to "advance education and educational methods through comprehensive voluntary and cooperative action on the part of American educational associations, organizations, and institutions /p. ii/."

The ACE is the most broadly representative association of higher education institutions and organizations in the United States. Its membership in 1966 was composed of 187 national and regional associations and organizations, 1,247 institutions of higher education, and 51 affiliated institutions and organizations (American Council on Education, undated, a). The major policy-making body of the Council--its Board of Directors--is made up primarily of representatives of the Council's institutional members. In 1965-66, the Board was composed of 24 members, 21 of whom were representatives of institutions belonging to the ACE. Nineteen of these were the chief executives of their respective colleges and universities (American Council on Education, 1966).

Collaboration between the Council and its constituent organizational members is, on the other hand, largely informal, taking place through voluntary consultation and cooperation among their executive officers. Among the formal bodies within the ACE, the Executive Director of a constituent association, Thackrey (1965) points out:

> . . .none is charged with concern for relationships with its constituent members, and the services which may be performed for them, ways in which consultation and coordination may be more effective. Of the twenty-four professional staff members as of the close of 1963, one was designated, on a part-time basis, for liaison with constituent members [p. 248].

As a result, Thackrey asserts, "the American Council on Education, founded as an organization of constituent members, is no longer (has not for many years been) the creature of its organizational constituency [p. 247]."

In its formal leadership, then, the ACE is primarily an "association of institutions," while in the make-up of its constituent membership and its broad coordinative purposes it functions in Washington as a "peak association" of institutionally tied higher education clubs. The significance of its largely informal relationship with other higher education organizations in Washington will be explored in Chapter 6.

Reflecting the broad coordinative concerns of the Council are the five national Commissions into which it is presently organized: the Commission on Plans and Objectives for Higher Education, the Commission on International Education, the Commission on Academic Affairs, the Commission on Administrative Affairs, and the Commission on Federal Relations.

The Commission on Federal Relations was established in 1940 (as the Committee on Relationships of Higher Education to the Federal Government) to act as special liaison between the federal government and the institutional members of the ACE. This body was strengthened and made a Commission in 1962, as part of the broader reorganization of the ACE, to meet the need for stronger, more coherent leadership in representing the interests of the higher education community to the government (American Council on Education, undated, b). Since 1962, particularly, the ACE, through this Commission, has come to play a key role in coordinating the legislative activities and articulating the common policy interests of institutionally tied associations in Washington. Considered by federal agencies and Congress to be the major spokesman for higher education in Washington, the ACE has frequently been called upon to testify on matters of broad higher education policy.

In the 1966 Annual Report, ACE's president said:

> . . .the Council now has an able and experienced staff in the area of Federal relations. Your staff members and others operating in behalf of the Council are in constant touch with congressional committees, executive agency officials, and a wide range of non-government groups. Our Commission on Federal Relations and our Board of Directors, representing our entire constituency, give policy guidance to the Council's Federal Relations staff. . .Council representation on /higher education policy/ issues can be most effective, however, when there is full consultation with the Washington-based association secretariat

> and with responsible executive agencies. . . In recent months, the Council staff, usually in close collaboration with other education associations, has presented the point of view of a united higher education in such diverse matters as selective service, long- and short-range administrative procedures, implementation of civil rights legislation, and the need for better and more timely statistical information[p. 2].

The coordinative and representative role of the ACE in Washington is a central topic of Chapter 6. It is our immediate purpose, however, to contrast the institutionally tied associations described above--with their primarily administrative focus on educational problems--to three quite different types of national higher education associations.

(2) DISCIPLINE-ORIENTED ASSOCIATIONS

The discipline-oriented association, or learned society, has been defined by Joseph Kiger (1962) as:

> . . .an organization composed of individuals devoted to a particular discipline or branch or group of disciplines in the humanities, social sciences, or natural sciences and primarily committed to the study and acquisition of knowledge in such a discipline [p. 2].

The primary interests and purposes of the discipline-oriented association relate to research--or the advancement of knowledge--in a discipline, in a group of related disciplines, or around a problem area. The academic members of such organizations are, for the most part, individual faculty members, although members may include academic administrators (participating in this organizational context as scholars rather than as representatives of institutions). Members of discipline-oriented associations also include nonacademic scholars who, in some instances, outnumber the academic members.

(For example, only 10% of the membership of the American Chemical Society consisted of academic personnel in 1950 /Strauss and Rainwater, 1962/.) Such organizations are included here as higher education associations when they represent the "pure" disciplines, whose "primary structural anchorage," in Parsons' (1966) words, "is clearly in the academic world /p. 125/," so that their most basic commitment is to research rather than to professional practice.

Although the members of discipline-oriented associations are most often individuals, some may be organizations--such as educational institutions and other learned societies. In contrast to institutionally tied associations, however, discipline-oriented associations do not have a major interest in maintaining or developing the educational institutions in which their members work.

There is, nevertheless, a growing tendency for such discipline-oriented societies to concern themselves with the development of university programs (and particularly the graduate programs) through which their members are trained. This tendency is one aspect of a significant change taking place in the structure and focus of discipline-oriented associations in the United States today. A comparison of the traditional learned society with the traditional (fully developed) professional association (no examples of which are included here as higher education associations) suggests the nature of this change.

In the case of the professional association (whose members are typically fee-for-service professionals), ". . .the raison d'être and primary emphasis," Kiger (1962) writes, "is upon the application of knowledge and/or for pecuniary purposes /p. 2/." Such professional societies as the American Medical Association and the American Bar Association are centrally concerned with professional practice, although they are also interested, to an increasing degree in the 20th century, in the advancement of the bodies of knowledge upon which professional practice is based. Their strong focus on the application of knowledge has characteristically involved professional associations in the performance of a fiduciary role--in the assumption of responsibility for enforcing minimum standards of professional training and performance through the accreditation of professional schools and through the adoption and enforcement of codes of ethical conduct for practicing professionals (Parsons, 1966).

The pure learned society, on the other hand, is only secondarily committed to the application of the knowledge its members possess or create. Its members are not, characteristically, engaged in professional practice, and, as a result, membership in the pure learned society is less likely to be contingent upon the satisfaction of formal educational requirements. Nor do learned societies tend to regulate the behavior of their members through the development and enforcement of professional codes of conduct.

Another important difference between the learned society and the professional association lies in the tendency for the professional association to have well-developed machinery for promoting the autonomy, prestige, and authority of the practitioners it represents. Promotion of the professions and of favorable conditions of work for practitioners became a major commitment of voluntary professional organizations at the turn of the century, Gilb (1966) explains, when urban, industrial conditions threatened the status which professionals had earlier enjoyed in the rural society of the 19th century.

> Because of the organizational revolution in business, labor, and other fields, and in particular because of the rise of the corporation, doctors and lawyers felt that they would have to organize more effectively or become mere employees, lose their clients and patients to corporations, or at the very least be forced to accept fees and conditions imposed by third-party intermediaries [p. 35].

The pure learned society, by contrast, has little organizational machinery for promoting the occupational prestige or conditions of work of its members either within the academic community or in the larger society. In these respects, then, the professional association is more strongly instrumental in focus than the learned society, which is organized around the scholarly pursuits of its members and has a lesser tendency to engage in "social influence" activity.

Changes taking place in the modern university and in the general society, as well as developments in modern science, have had an impact, however, on the expressive character of such discipline-oriented associations.

Parsons (1966) points, first of all, to the professionalization of academic roles.

> The most obvious aspect of this has been the progressive diminution of "amateur" status in academic matters, in favor of the role played by people to whom it is an occupational role in the full sense. . .This trend has been accompanied by the formalization of prerequisites for academic appointments in the sense of training requirements. It is only in about the last generation that the Ph. D. has come to be the standard qualification for "good" appointments in the system. By the criteria both of full-time employment and relatively formalized training prerequisites--though not licensing--the core members of the academic disciplines, those in academic appointments, certainly constitute professional groups /p. 125/.

At the same time, the size of the academic professions has increased very considerably since World War II. In line with these developments, discipline-oriented associations have themselves undergone dramatic growth and have, in many instances, taken steps to restrict their membership to applicants possessing academic credentials.

Second, heightened importance of scientific knowledge and of basic research for technological and social advance, as well as the growing cost of research operations and facilities in many fields, has brought the academic disciplines to rely directly upon extra-university sources of financial aid, encouraging them to compete among themselves in the public arena for research funds. Under the pressure of these developments, a significant number of discipline-oriented associations have begun to engage actively in the representation of member interests to both private and public granting agencies. In addition, new pressures are being placed on research scientists to take responsibility for the application of the new knowledge in the solution of social and technological problems--leading to new interdisciplinary disputes concerning jurisdiction over areas of practice. Here, too, many academic associations have come to play a broader instrumental role in defending the legitimacy and autonomy of their members as professional practitioners.

Third, the new size and centrality of the academic disciplines in modern industrial society has created a need, many academicians argue, for codification and enforcement of standards of ethical conduct on the part of the academic professions themselves. As a result, a number of discipline-oriented associations have recently developed (or have considered developing) codes of ethics applying to the diverse aspects of the professional performance of academic scholars: research, publication, consultation, and social action.

Finally, it should be added, as institutions of higher learning have become increasingly bureaucratized in the 20th century, academic faculties have faced a threat similar to that confronted by practicing professionals at the turn of the century (and confronted presently by those practitioners who work for large organizations), the potentiality for finding themselves in the status of mere "employees." Significantly, however, the task of organizing faculty members to defend their status and autonomy within the university has fallen not so much to the discipline-oriented associations of which they are members as to the organizations defined later as faculty-oriented.

The American Sociological Association (ASA)

The American Sociological Association was founded in 1905 at a joint meeting of the American Historical, Economic, and Political Science Associations (Kiger, 1962). Its specific purpose, as stated in Article II of its Constitution, is to stimulate and improve sociological "research, instruction and discussion, and to encourage cooperative relations among persons engaged in the scientific study of society." Membership in the ASA, according to Article III of its Constitution, is open to "any person interested in the objects of this Association."

Between 1905 and the beginning of World War II, the ASA remained a small scholarly society (with fewer than a thousand members as late as 1939) devoted primarily to holding conferences and annual meetings and to the publication of the *American Journal of Sociology*, the *American Sociological Review* (established in 1936), and the annual *Publication and Proceedings of the American Sociological Society*. The total expenses of the Association in 1939 amounted to $7,893, of which more than $6,000 was devoted to the publication of the *American Sociological Review* (Faris, 1965). During these years, the headquarters of the Association shifted from campus to campus, following a succession of elected administrative officers who managed Association affairs on a purely voluntary basis.

By 1948, however, the membership and annual budget of the ASA had more than doubled, encouraging the establishment in that year of a permanent Association office in New York City and the appointment of a paid executive officer and office staff. By 1965, the membership had climbed to more than 8,000, and the budget of the Association was just under $1 million.

Major subdivisions within the ASA are based on specialization of sociological interest among its members, who have created Sections for the exploration of problems within specific subject matter areas. In addition, two subject areas are represented by sociological societies affiliated with the ASA: the Society for the Study of Social Problems and the Rural Sociological Society. Also affiliated with the Association are six regional societies which elect members to the ASA Council.

In addition to a rapid increase in size and the increased specialization of scientific interests among its members, the ASA has undergone--particularly in the last decade--a process of gradual professionalization affecting its policies and activities with regard to membership, certification, professional ethics and standards, and the relationship of the Association to the federal government.

Membership. In 1946, the ASA adopted a recommendation, stated in its bylaws (1967), to classify its members and restrict full membership and voting rights in the Association (previously enjoyed by any person who paid the Association dues) to applicants having:

(a) --a Ph. D. or equivalent professional training in Sociology as determined by the Classification Committee, or
(b) --substantial achievement in Sociology, or,
(c) --a Ph. D. or its equivalent or substantial professional achievement in a closely related field, provided that the applicant's interest and activities have a sociological orientation /Article 1/.

Certification. In 1956, members of the ASA became concerned about a policy initiated by the American Psychological Association (APA), as reported by Parsons (1959):

> . . .to seek legislative certification of the rights of psychologists, by title, to offer their services for fees to clients. This threatened to exclude, or subject to certification procedures by Boards of psychologists only, and on terms determined by them, social psychologists trained in sociology and professionally affiliated with sociology /p. 879/.

Responding to the initiation of this APA policy, the president of the ASA established a Committee on the

Profession to consider the professional rights and interests of sociologists. The Committee on the Profession established, in turn, a Subcommittee on Legislation that Certifies Psychologists, to deal for the Association with the APA. An agreement was eventually reached (Sanders, 1961) whereby the APA "undertakes to see that an exemption clause in behalf of sociologically-trained social psychologists [is] inserted in any legislation certifying or licensing psychologists [p. 989]," while the ASA, for its part, took steps to establish its own certification procedures. Following a period of preparation, an ASA Committee on Certification of Social Psychologists began in 1965, Clausen (1965) reports, to consider applications for certification from ASA members having "a major commitment to the provision of counseling or therapeutic services [p. 47]."

Professional ethics. In 1960, in response to the growing number of problems concerning professional ethics which had come before the Association recently, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Profession formulated a code of ethical conduct for sociologists to cover problems in the areas of teaching, research, consulting, writing and publishing, the relationship of the profession to the public, and professional practice (Young, 1960; Angell, 1963). Circulation of a draft code to Association members in 1964, however, led to heated controversy within the Association, and no formal code was adopted.

In 1967, a new Committee on Professional Ethics was appointed by the Association president to reexamine the problem of ethical standards. In the last few years, the Association's executive officer pointed out (Volkart, 1967, a), "a number of events, particularly involving the federal government and social scientists, have once again raised questions of ethical responsibility and propriety, particularly in sociological research [p. 162]." Congressional concern over invasion of privacy in social research and an Executive Order making the Department of State responsible for reviewing and approving all federally financed social science projects to be carried on overseas were among the developments which seemed to threaten freedom of sociological inquiry. "It may be," the executive officer warned, "that if social scientists themselves cannot agree on at least some fundamental principles guiding their research, external standards and norms may be imposed by legislation or administrative action or both /p. 162/."

Members of the new Committee on Professional Ethics met in June 1967 and agreed to explore further the question of what kind of ethical code the ASA might most appropriately adopt (Volkart, 1967, b). By the summer of 1968, the ASA had taken no official action on the adoption of a code of ethical conduct for its members. But the continued concern of the Association with problems of professional ethics is symptomatic, in itself, of the pressure upon many learned societies in the United States today to assume a fiduciary role in relation to the academic disciplines.

Professional standards. During the late 1950's, the Committee on the Profession initiated a study of graduate training in sociology and established a Committee on Training and Professional Standards to consider the results of this study when completed. Ultimately, it is the purpose of this Committee on Training to formulate "a set of recommendations on desirable and necessary facilities for graduate training" in sociology (Campbell, 1965). In 1967, a similar Committee on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology was formed within the ASA (Hollingshead, 1967). The formation and activities of these two committees--and the other committees described above--are an important indication of the increasing concern of the ASA in recent years with establishing professional standards.

Relationship to the federal government. A Subcommittee on Sociology in the Federal Government was established by the Committee on the Profession in the late 1950's (Clausen, 1959) "to provide relevant information about and a measure of representation of the Society's interests in the Federal government /p. 882/." Pleading its own inability to represent sociologists in Washington on anything but a "partial and temporary basis," this subcommittee urged the installation of a permanent, paid representative of the Association in Washington to help meet the needs of Congress and federal agencies for sociological expertise in formulating governmental programs. A Washington representative, the subcommittee pointed out, would also facilitate relations with other social science associations already established in Washington, with whom the ASA might advantageously cooperate in furthering mutual interests.

The executive office of the ASA was moved from New York to Washington in 1964. In a 1965 issue of the American Sociological Review, an ASA member (Gans, 1965) asserted confidently:

> . . .we have established a Washington office and asked the Executive Officer to spend some of his time lobbying for the advancement of sociology, and helping to build a coalition of other research groups to lobby more effectively, although we do not use that word to describe his activity /p. 130/.

In 1966, however, the executive officer reported in an interview that he had found little opportunity to establish extensive relations with other social science associations or with the federal government (Volkart, 1966). The internal affairs of the Association--which had become in the 1960's an extensive business operation--preoccupied the executive officer and nine full-time members of the office staff, leaving little time or financial support for providing technical assistance to the government, monitoring government activity and making information on government programs related to sociology available to ASA members, or for representing the professional interests of sociologists in Washington. Nevertheless, rising federal support of social science (from $73 million in 1960 to $325 million in 1966, for example--an increase of 440% --according to Orlans, 1967) and the concomitant threat of unacceptable federal restrictions on the conduct of social science research had begun to provide strong incentives for the development of machinery within the ASA Washington office for playing a more effective representative role in relation to government.

The American Physical Society (APS)

The American Physical Society was established in 1899 by a group of physicists who had previously met together annually as members of Section B of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. This independent Society, the purpose of which was the "advancement and diffusion of knowledge of physics," grew from a membership of less than 3,000 in 1932 to 10,000 in 1951 (American Physical Society, 1951), and 24,000 in 1968 (*Encyclopedia of associations*, 1968). By comparison, the American Sociological Association, founded only six years later, had a membership of less than 4,000 in 1951 (Faris, 1965) and less than 12,000 in 1967 (*American Sociologist*, 1967).

The APS Constitution provides for three types of membership: Fellow, the main requirement for which is an original contribution to physics theory through independent research; Member, open to physics students and teachers or persons working in related fields who have not completed research justifying Fellowship status; and Honorary Member, open only to outstanding scientists from other countries. Only Fellows can hold office in the Society (American Physical Society, 1951).

Six Divisions had been established within the APS by 1960 (Kiger, 1962), each of them dedicated to "the advancement and diffusion of knowledge of a specified subject or subjects in physics /p. 81/." Regional Sections were also added to the Society some years after its formation and numbered five in 1951 (American Physical Society, 1951).

Since its inception, the Society has maintained a central office in New York; the office had a paid staff of 28 in 1968 (*Encyclopedia of associations*, 1968). The primary tasks of this office are the arrangement of seven or eight technical meetings each year, the publication of several technical journals and of the APS *Bulletin*, which provides the membership with the programs of Society meetings in advance.

Significantly, there are few indications within the APS of the kind of professionalization process occuring in the American Sociological Association, despite a much larger membership, a greater number and percentage of physicists doing applied research in industry and in government, and an earlier and more intense involvement of the physical sciences in national defense and welfare programs which has resulted in much more extensive federal support of physical science than of social science research. Despite many indications of the centrality of physics in modern industrial society, the APS has not, for example, established a permanent representative in Washington, D. C., has not concerned itself extensively with promoting or defending the physics profession to the general public, and has not taken steps to regulate the professional conduct of its members through the adoption of a code of professional ethics.

One partial explanation for the retention by the APS of a narrower, more technical focus is undoubtedly the lesser involvement of physicists (than of many other kinds of scientists) in research or practice directly involving human subjects. Certification and licensure have not been considered necessary in relation to the pursuit of physics, nor has there been as much pressure on physical science associations as upon associations representing the social, biological, and medical sciences to play a fiduciary role with regard to the professional conduct of their members.

More importantly, however, the APS seems to have retained the more expressive focus of the traditional learned society as a result of its membership in a comprehensive or "umbrella" physics association--the American Institute of Physics--which has as an explicit purpose the representation of physics to industry, the government, and the general public. It is in the activities of this larger Institute that changes in physics as a profession have been most clearly reflected in recent decades.

The American Institute of Physics (AIP)

The American Institute of Physics was founded in 1931 by a joint committee of the American Physical Society, the Optical Society of America, and the Acoustical Society of America. To these three founding members were shortly added the Society of Rheology and the American Association of Physics Teachers, and more recently, the American Crystallographic Association and the American Astronomical Society (AIP, 1968). The AIP's Constitution was changed in 1948 to allow for individual as well as organizational membership, making the individual members of the constituent societies automatically members of the Institute as well. The total number of individual members in the five member societies in 1932 was roughly 3,500, a combined membership which had grown to about 25,000 in the early 1960's (Kiger, 1962). In 1968, individual AIP members--including the members of all seven constituent societies--numbered 35,500 (of which 24,000 were members of the American Physical Society alone); and 17 affiliated societies, 160 Corporate Associates (corporations, institutions, and laboratories), and 270 student sections had been added to the Institute (Encyclopedia of associations, 1968).

Originally conceived as a means of offsetting the dispersal of physicists into specialized fields, this federation of societies is dedicated to:

> . . .the advancement and diffusion of the knowledge of physics and its applications to human welfare. To this end the Institute publishes for itself and the societies 33 journals (including translations) bulletins and programs; promotes unity and effectiveness of effort among all who are interested in physics, renders numerous direct services to physicists and the public and cooperates with government agencies, national associations, educational institutions, technical industries and others in such a manner as to realize the opportunities and fulfill the responsibilities of physics as an important and constructive human activity [American Institute of Physics, 1968, p. 6].

While stressing the commitment of the AIP to the advancement and diffusion of knowledge in the physical sciences, this broad statement of purpose indicates, as well, an intention to promote the application of physics toward national technological advance and to represent physicists as a professional group to governmental and private organizations and to the general public.

Three years after the founding of the AIP, an Advisory Council on Applied Physics was appointed within the Institute to give special attention to promoting physics to industry. A past director of the AIP has reported (Barton, 1956) that the

> . . .recommendations of this group were successful in producing a much more open attitude on the part of industries toward the employment of physicists and a greater willingness of physicists to take jobs outside of the academic environment [p. 58].

In addition, the advice of this Council resulted in a Joint Meeting on Applied Physics in 1936, involving all of the Institute's member societies, and in the establishment of an AIP-sponsored Journal of Applied Physics.

During World War II, the director of the AIP, H. A. Barton (1956), by his own report, "spent half of his time in Washington, mainly on manpower and Selective Service problems [p. 60]," and was instrumental in establishing the Office of Scientific Personnel of the National Research Council. An AIP War Policy Committee was also appointed to represent physics in Washington during the war years. Barton states:

> The Committee issued statements urging the study of physics, the training of teachers, and the use of occupational draft deferments to further the technological war effort. Much of the Committee's effectiveness, however, was in direct recommendations to high officials and boards in the War Manpower Commission, the War and Navy Departments,

> and the War Production Board. As a result of these, the over-all contribution of physicists in those times of great emergency and confusion was much greater than it might otherwise have been [p. 60].

Following World War II, however, the central office of the AIP remained in New York, and despite a constantly growing paid Institute staff (numbering 168 persons by the middle 1960's, [*Encyclopedia of associations*, 1968]), no permanent AIP office or representative was established in Washington until 1966. During this two-decade period, no formal AIP committee seems to have dealt regularly with federal agencies and officials, and relations with the government were a rare topic in the Institute's annual reports.

In the AIP annual report for 1963, the institute's director, Hutchisson (1964), asserts that "a major effort of the Institute is directed toward the development of greater understanding and appreciation on the part of the public of progress in physics [p. 47]." As part of this public relations program, the Institute undertook in 1963 to prepare and distribute to news media popularized versions of more than 40 physics journal articles in an effort to increase public understanding of advances being made in physics research. In addition, the AIP (as in previous years) maintained pressrooms at the meetings of each of its member societies, making available to the press abstracts, in lay language, of papers presented there.

Through its Education and Manpower Department, the AIP has also made extensive efforts, Hutchisson (1964) states, "to encourage and assist in the training of physicists in adequate numbers and depth of understanding to meet the needs of the highly scientific age in which we are living [p. 48]." The Institute cooperates with the National Science Foundation in gathering current information on the education and employment of physicists for the National Register of Scientific and Technical Personnel, and it has established a number of programs to attract students to physics and to improve the training of physicists on the secondary, undergraduate, and graduate levels.

In its early encouragement of the use of physicists in industry, in its role as liaison with the government during World War II, and more recently, in its public relations and education and manpower activities, the AIP has consistently encouraged the development and support of physics as a profession as well as its involvement in national advancement--thus alleviating pressures on its member learned societies to promote or defend the professional interests of their members in the public sphere. The commitment of the AIP to professional concerns as early as 1931 reflects the early growth and specialization of the physical sciences and the increasing centrality of physics, even before World War II, in American Industrial life.

Given the particular importance of physics research as a national resource during and following World War II, and given the close interdependence of science and government since the early 1940's, it is necessary to account for the minimal activity of the AIP as a spokesman for physical science interests in Washington, D. C., during much of this critical period in science-government relations.

Chapter 2 provided a description of the growth of federal support of academic research during and following World War II and of the need which this massive federal aid created for new channels of communication and influence between the university community and the government. The spectacular accomplishments of scientists during World War II gave the national government strong incentive to look to the technical expertise of scientists to guide the development of federal government-university relations. In the early postwar years, the system of project research (in which university scientists, acting as members of advisory groups, made recommendations to federal agencies concerning the research proposals of their peers) gave scientists considerable control over the allocation of federal funds for academic research. Greenberg (1967) writes:

> Though reins and restrictions existed and the principle of accountability (loathsome to the scientists) was never absent, the essential point was that, in practice, scientists wrote most of the rules for the use of federal research money; scientists staffed the agency that dispensed the money, and scientists from the university community advised these same staff scientists on the distribution of the money [p. 270].

In addition, the advent of Sputnik in the late 1950's raised scientific research to a new level of public concern and resulted in the establishment of a network of high-level science advisors within the executive branch of government. The post of Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, the President's Science Advisory Committee, the Federal Council for Science and Technology, and the Office of Science and Technology were all created within the space of six years to advise the President directly about the support needs of science. Harvey Brooks (1964), a onetime member of the President's Science Advisory Committee, states that "an important part of the task initially facing the Special Assistant [the President's Science Advisor] was to promote the support of science, particularly basic science, in every way possible [p. 83]." Having played a highly influential role in the design of the grants and contracts system of research support, scientists thus continued to wield considerable influence over the shaping of federal science policy through participation in scientific advisory bodies at all levels of the government. And during the last decade particularly, the scientific community has had highly influential spokesmen in government with direct access to the President.

As a result of the development of such effective linkages between the executive branch of government and nongovernmental scientists, there was little pressure on scientific discipline-oriented associations during the two decades following the war to serve as representatives of the scientific community to government. Nor did the government have need to call upon these associations to provide it with technical expertise upon which to base policy decisions. Even the National Academy of Sciences, chartered by Congress in 1863 to provide the government with expert scientific advice, remained somewhat remote from the mainstream of government-science relations during this period of deep and extensive federal interest in scientific advance. D. S. Greenberg wrote in 1965:

> At one time members of the scientific community looked upon the Academy as their Washington embassy, but now they have found many friends to look after their needs in the Capital. Executive agencies still ask the Academy for advice, and it is the task of fulfilling these requests that occupies the Academy staff and their consultants. But the executive agencies feel increasingly confident of their own scientific abilities, and it is not uncommon for them to use the Academy for only routine purposes or to seek its imprimatur when they want to acquire some insulation for a politically controversial move /p. 716/.

Thus, the availability of scientific expertise within the executive agencies themselves and, conversely, the direct access of university scientists to the loci of important decision making within government reduced the incentive for national science associations such as the AIP (and, similarly, the American Institute of Biological Sciences and the American Association for the Advancement of Science) to develop organizational machinery for representing the scientific disciplines in the political sphere.*

---

*This is not to say that these scientific societies had no direct dealings with the government during the postwar years. Many did extensive work under grant and contract for a wide range of government agencies. The AIP, for example, which has always relied more heavily on industrial than on federal support, nevertheless received $1,500,000 in contracts and grants from four government agencies between 1931 and 1960 (Kiger, 1962).

The 1960's (which have seen a dramatic increase in federal support for social science research) have witnessed, however, a gradual leveling off of government allocations for research (and particularly basic research) in the natural sciences as well as a growing skepticism in Congress regarding the unlimited value and legitimacy of previously well-supported science programs. The first signs of change in the postwar pattern of government-science relations appeared, in the early 1960's, in the form of a report by the House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee (chaired by Congressman Fountain of North Carolina) which recommended a partial reorganization of the National Institutes of Health's (NIH) research grant procedures. The review and assessment of NIH grant applications by an advisory committee of nongovernmental scientists should be supplemented, the Fountain committee suggested, by a more systematic budget examination to be conducted by "qualified analysts" in NIH's Division of Research Grants to assure the appropriate use of, and adequate accounting for, NIH funds. In this recommendation, Greenberg (1967) asserts:

> Fountain was chopping at the ventricles of the economic system that pure science had laboriously assembled in the postwar period, for, in effect, he was contesting the traditional scientific view that the internal value system of science guaranteed an ethical standard [in the use of federal funds] that required no outside surveillance or reinforcement [p. 277].

Followed a year later by Congressman Fountain's open accusation of "waste and extravagance" in the use of NIH funds, the Fountain report ushered in a new era of Congressional concern for federal support of science.

Congress had tended through the 1940's and 1950's to play a somewhat passive role in acceding to requests from the executive branch for science appropriations. In the early 1960's, however, the sheer magnitude of government expenditures for scientific research, and their dramatic rate of increase since World War II, began, inevitably, to attract closer Congressional attention to this area of federal activity--particularly as the Vietnam war cut into domestic spending. New Congressional reluctance to maintain the postwar rate of increase in allocations for science called for new forms of coordinative activity among members of the scientific community, who feared that tighter money might lead to open competition among disciplinary groups for scarce research funds.

An early response to this threat came from the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) which established, in 1962, a Committee on Science and Public Policy (COSPUP) to act as a single spokesman to government for the scientific community (National Academy of Sciences, 1964, b). Composed of "senior statesmen" of the NAS who represented fourteen scientific disciplines, the COSPUP was created to provide a locus outside of government for a realistic appraisal by scientists themselves of scientific research needs in coming years. And with new tensions rising between government and the scientific community over cutbacks in research support, a major factor in the legitimacy of this Committee as an objective spokesman for scientific interests was precisely its extragovernmental status (National Academy of Sciences, 1964, [illegible]). In his 1963 *Annual Report* to the members of the American Institute of Physics, Hutchisson (1964), states directly:

> It has become very clear that unless physicists and other scientists themselves analyze critically the needs of various areas of basic research, a competition for funds will develop which will be settled not by scientists but by others who may not see as clearly as scientists do the long-range implications of the research. The National Academy of Sciences has already taken steps to meet this problem and the Institute stands ready to help in any way it can [p. 109].

In 1967, an AIP Committee on Physics and Society (COMPAS) was established to study the relationships between the physics community and education, industry, and government. One fundamental purpose of the Committee, an early description (AIP establishes new programs, 1967) stated, "will be to advise the Governing Board of the AIP on. . .the future goals and direction of the organized physics community in America in regard to the direction and financing of basic and applied research [p. 53]." A subcommittee of this body immediately "commissioned a study of the effects of cutbacks in government funds on academic physics research [Johnsrud, 1968, p. 50]." One year earlier, the Institute had already formally "extended its activities to Washington, D. C." with the appointment of an AIP representative, and the establishment of an office, in the Capital (Hodes, 1967).

Neither the COMPAS nor the new AIP representative in Washington represents dramatic change in the instrumental activity of the Institute in the political sphere, but these developments are among the many indications of increasing pressure on the AIP and other scientific discipline-oriented associations in the 1960's to enter into a more active role as advocates for the needs of science in the changing relationship between science and government. An important aspect of this change in government-science relations is the new centrality of Congress in determining science policy. As the locus of critical decisions regarding science support in the coming years, Congress faces a growing need for high-caliber scientific advice, and because of the demand of the legislative branch for continuing independence from the executive (and its network of science advisors) in its own quest for scientific expertise, Congress has begun to turn to scientific organizations outside the government to provide it with technical advice. An article in *Physics Today* (Daddario urges societies) reported in 1967, for example, that

> Congressman Emilio Daddario (D-Conn.), chairman of the House Sub-committee on Science, Research and Development, wants the scientific societies to step forward and help Congress assess the impact of science and technology on national problems. This is not the first time Daddario has sought the assistance of scientific societies, but in recent months he has once more, and with

> particular stress, repeated his plea for the authoritative technical advice that scientific councils can provide.
>
> In a recent address before the National Association of College and University Business Officers, the congressman noted, "There is one important source of advice to the Congress which I do not believe has been sufficiently tapped. I refer to the professional society [p. 83]."

In recognition of both the new importance of Congress in formulating science policy and enhanced Congressional needs for technical advice, the NAS's Committee on Science and Public Policy accepted an invitation in 1964 to provide scientific and engineering advice to Daddario's House Science and Astronautics Committee (National Academy of Sciences, 1964, b). In this new willingness to enter into harsh Congressional politics--for which the scientific community has long had a particular distaste--the NAS set a precedent which other scientific associations such as the AIP will, no doubt, be increasingly compelled to follow.

Thus, the professionalization of many social and natural science learned societies has brought them, in the middle 1960's, to the brink of politicization--a term used here to mean the active involvement of associations in providing expert information and advice to government, in representing the interests and needs of their members to government, and in defending the professional autonomy of their members in their widening and deepening relationships to federal agencies and Congress. For most social science associations, such as the American Sociological Association, politicization means a relatively new involvement with government. For many natural science societies, on the other hand, the politicization process means an extension of the role of service organization, performing innumerable research tasks for the government under agency grants and contracts, to include advocacy to government of the needs of the scientific community.

For both the social science and the natural science associations, there are strong incentives in the 1960's to begin to defend scientific values in the political arena against political decisions regarding research priorities or acceptable research procedures. In addition, as the cost of advancing knowledge soars, these discipline-oriented associations are being pressed to the task of promoting adequate support for the disciplines whose advancement remains their central concern. And finally, as academicians perceive the potential utility of their scientific knowledge in the solution of technical and social problems, they look to their disciplinary associations to promote the use of that knowledge in practical programs--programs often sponsored and administered by government agencies.

FACULTY-ORIENTED ASSOCIATIONS

The primary focus of the faculty-oriented association is on the promotion of the profession of teaching within institutions of higher education. Concerns include, therefore, institutional policies related to such matters as academic tenure and freedom and faculty salaries. Many of the interests of the faculty-oriented organization overlap those of institutionally tied associations and involve the development of educational institutions within which scholarly activity can be carried on under favorable or desirable conditions. There is, however, little overlap of membership between institutionally tied and faculty-oriented associations, the former having primarily institutional members and the latter having a membership composed entirely of individual faculty members.

There are, within higher education, two major national associations of the faculty-oriented type--the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Only the AAUP has a membership composed entirely of college and university faculty and is concerned exclusively with college-level teaching. Consequently, it is this organization which will be considered here.

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP)

The American Association of University Professors was founded in 1915 by 650 eminent college and university professors. By January of 1968, its membership was roughly 90,000 (Membership, 1968). An early expression of interest in such an association was contained in a letter sent in 1913 by 18 faculty members of Johns Hopkins University to professors at a number of other leading American universities and colleges; the letter asserted that while

> . . .the specialized interests of academics were served by the disciplinary societies . . .their *institutional* and *societal* interests, which were equally important and pressing, were not being adequately cared for; and that for this purpose an ecumenical society was required [Metzger, 1965, p. 231; italics mine].

Of particular concern to the society's early members, Metzger reports, was the negative impact on the professorial profession of the rapid growth of higher education in the United States. Academic standards were threatened, they believed, by the hiring of larger numbers of faculty members. Universities were coming under increasing administrative domination, and academic freedom was becoming more vulnerable to attack from external pressure groups.

These concerns strongly resembled the basic concerns of the fee-for-service professionals at the turn of the century who felt it necessary to organize more effectively to protect their prestige, authority, and autonomy in a rapidly industrializing, urbanizing society (Gilb, 1966). The professional interests of college professors differed primarily in being focused on the organizations in which they were employed and within which their autonomy and authority (if not their wider occupational prestige) were threatened. The focus of the AAUP also differed clearly from that of discipline-oriented associations (and continues to differ, even as these societies professionalize) in its lack of direct concern for the advancement of knowledge in a particular discipline or group of related disciplines.

As a professional association, then, the AAUP has a strongly institutional, rather than disciplinary, focus. To qualify for Active Membership in the AAUP, for example, an applicant must hold, according to the Constitution of the Association (1967), "a position of teaching or research in a university or college in the United States or Canada. . .or in a professional school of similar grade /Article 2, p. 243/."

And in the last half century, the majority of Association activities have consisted of attempts to influence institutional policies related to the employment of faculty members.

The first committee established at the 1915 organization meeting of the Association--and one which has been continuously active ever since--was the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (Committee A). A 1965 AAUP Bulletin (American Association of University Professors) asserts:

> Its defense of academic freedom is that part of the Association's work for which it has been most widely known, at least until quite recent years, both inside and outside of the academic world. And of all the current activities which the Association carries on, the work of Committee A is the greatest in volume and complexity; we have estimated that it consumes roughly from 40 to 50 percent of the time and energies of the professional staff at Washington /p. 145/.

Until the late 1950's, Metzger (1965) reports, "an objective observer would have had to conclude that the AAUP was Committee A to all practical and apparent purposes /p. 236, italics mine/."

The work of Committee A consists primarily of investigations into cases of alleged infringement by higher education institutions of AAUP standards on academic freedom and of the formulation of recommendations regarding the imposition or removal of censure from those institutions investigated.* In this, as in other areas of AAUP activity, efforts to influence university procedure take the form of published AAUP statements regarding acceptable faculty employment practices and of public censure of institutions judged not to meet these Association standards. The following documents are among those guiding Committee A decisions on appropriate institutional behavior or policy: Statement on procedural standards in faculty dismissal proceedings (Spring 1964), Committee A statement on extramural utterances (Spring 1965), and The standards for notice of non-reappointment (Autumn 1964). Such statements have occasionally been prepared with the assistance of institutionally tied associations whose interests they directly affect. The important 1940 statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure was, for example, prepared in conjunction with the Association of American Colleges, and has been approved in 1968 by 60 other higher education associations (Endorsers of the 1940 statement, 1968). In addition, two statements have been prepared in recent years in cooperation with the American Council on Education, and the Association's general secretary has reported cooperation with a number of other associations in completing the AAUP Statement on the academic freedom of students in 1967 (Jacobson, 1967).

The last decade has seen an expansion of AAUP activities on behalf of the college and university teaching profession through the establishment or reactivation of a number of committees (American Association of University Professors, 1965). A long dormant Committee on Professional Ethics (Committee B), for example, was revitalized and charged with formulating a statement of principles or code of ethics concerning the conduct of faculty members as a correlative of the many Association statements regarding academic freedom and tenure. A Committee on College and University Teaching, Research, and Publication (Committee C) has recently conducted

---

*At the 1968 annual meeting of the AAUP, for example, a record total of nine higher education institutions was censured by the Association for failing to uphold its standards on academic freedom and tenure, while removal of censure was authorized for six institutions whose policies had changed in recent years, bringing them into new accord with AAUP principles. Ten previously censured colleges and universities were retained on the Association's censure list (Jacobson, 1968).

> . . .studies regarding the recruitment of college teachers, provisions for sabbatical leaves, institutional support for attendance at meetings of learned societies, and other matters of great importance for the maintenance of professional standards; and it hopes to launch, with foundation support, a study "in depth" of the academic profession under the guidance of Professor Talcott Parsons /p. 107/.

The Committee on Accrediting of Colleges and Universities (Committee D) has made efforts to establish contact with regional accrediting agencies, to convey to these agencies the AAUP's vital interest in the accrediting process as a means of maintaining quality in higher education, and to urge the agencies to pay special attention to faculty morale and status and local conditions of academic freedom and tenure at the institutions they examine.

Since 1959, the Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession, Committee Z, has presented annual reports on the results of a salary grading program in which letter grades are assigned to academic institutions; these grades are based on the minimum salaries paid to faculty members in each academic rank and upon the average salaries paid in each rank. The Report of the Self-Survey Committee of the AAUP (American Association of University Professors, 1965) states:

> . . .at the end of six years' experience, it can be asserted that there has been a remarkable increase in salary levels at all

> ranks, the number of institutions cooperating in making reports and consenting to publication has almost tripled, and there has been an enormous increase in the morale of members of the profession. The annual reports of the Salary Grading Program have become, perhaps, of all the Association's reports, the most avidly read by presidents and professors alike /p. 108/.

Among the major accomplishments of the AAUP in recent years, according to a statement by the general secretary of the Association (Jacobson, 1967), has been the work of the Committee on the Relations of Higher Education to Federal and State Government (Committee R). The Report of the Self-Survey Committee of the AAUP states:

> . . .since higher education and research in this country are now largely supported by government. . .and since they are subject to myriad influences and controls through governmental channels, it is inevitable that the Association, in promoting these interests, deals extensively with governmental agencies /p. 17/.

Thus, with the growing impact of government on the functioning of higher education institutions and on the work of faculty members, the AAUP has had to broaden the scope of its instrumental activities, which were previously focused almost exclusively upon the universities and colleges within which its members were employed.

In line with its major concern for academic freedom, the Association has become involved with the federal government primarily over questions related to the professional autonomy of university faculty members. The AAUP has been, for example,

> . . .in the forefront of organizational opposition to legislative prescription of loyalty oaths and disclaimer affidavits as conditions of participation in

> governmental programs dealing with education and research. It was probably the strongest and most active opponent of the disclaimer affidavit in the National Defense Education and National Science Foundation Acts, and it is now concerned with the reappearance of a similar affidavit requirement in the new Economic Opportunity (poverty program) Act [p. 177].

As federal support of higher education expands to cover new educational programs and activities, a rising number of such legislative issues will undoubtedly lead to increased AAUP activity in the political sphere.

Where infringement on academic freedom is threatened by federal legislation, the basic concerns of the AAUP overlap, of course, those of national discipline-oriented associations, whose members are often the direct recipients of conditional research funds. It is with institutionally tied associations in Washington, D. C., however, that the AAUP has found itself in greatest accord in its opposition to restrictive education legislation. Where disclaimer affidavits are included in such broad legislation as the National Defense Education Act, for instance, institutional autonomy and the academic freedom of individual professors are equally threatened. Thus, the 1965 Report of the Self-Survey Committee states:

> . . .it is in connection with federal government representation that the Association's connections with other organizations in the field of higher education seem to be strongest. While there are certainly differences of opinion among the various organizations and their representatives, the interchange of views and information among them is highly valuable, and there are many occasions in which they can act in concerted fashion and multiply their strength [p. 178-179].

Among the national associations with which the AAUP has had frequent occasion to cooperate are the American

Council on Education, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Universities, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and the American Association of Junior Colleges.

Roughly five or six percent of the time of the professional association staff in Washington was devoted to federal relations in 1965. The Report of the Self-Survey Committee of the AAUP suggests that "in view of the growing importance and complexity of [relations with the government] the present expenditure of time and resources is minimal, and. . .will and should increase [p. 178]."

SPECIAL TASK ASSOCIATIONS

Special task associations, though most similar to institutionally tied associations in the nature of their basic interests, are distinguished from the latter by their narrow focus on specific problems or functions related to the development, coordination, or support of higher education programs. Among the most important functions performed by special task organizations, from the point of view of promoting order in the higher education system nationally, is the provision of national accrediting and testing services. Other association tasks included here as involving a relatively narrow focus are fund-raising and the distribution of funds through scholarships, fellowships, and the like. Membership in special task associations consists of both academic administrators and faculty as well as of educational and noneducational organizations.

The National Commission on Accrediting (NCA)

The National Commission on Accrediting was created in 1949--the outgrowth of a Joint Committee on Accrediting established ten years earlier by the Association of Land-Grand Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities. The purpose of the Joint Committee, and of the subsequent Commission, was to simplify, coordinate, and improve accrediting standards and practices in the United States (Hefferlin, 1965).

The formation of the Joint Committee on Accrediting in 1938 has been referred to by Hefferlin (1965) as a "presidential revolt" against the proliferation, during the 1930's, of myriad accrediting agencies whose demands on American colleges and universities were frequently in competition, and which seemed to be "setting institutional policies by remote control /p.2/." Many of these accrediting bodies were professional organizations (such as the American Medical Association) seeking to raise professional standards through the improvement of education programs in their respective professional schools. The multiplication of such agencies, with their specialized and uncoordinated demands upon academic institutions, seemed to higher education administrators to threaten the liberal arts function of American colleges and universities and to undermine administrative authority over them. In response to the need to defend institutional autonomy against the undue and fragmenting influence of outside groups, university presidents determined to create their own organization to accredit accrediting agencies.

The long-range purpose of the Joint Committee, its founding associations agreed, would be to direct itself toward

> . . .an elimination of some of the existing accrediting agencies, if possible, simplification of the procedures, reduction of duplication, removal of dictation from groups outside the educational field, and restoration of responsibility to states and institutions /Hefferlin, 1965, p. 2/.

It was a purpose subsequently inherited by the NCA. By 1954, however. the Commission had not succeeded in eliminating a number of professional agencies or placing their functions under the supervision of more comprehensive regional associations (responsible for accrediting higher education institutions rather than separate professional programs). Thus, it was established that:

> . . .the Commission would henceforth continue to place major responsibility for

> accreditation on the regional associations, but it would not expect them to supervise the professional agencies nor to assume the latter's accrediting functions. Instead it would expect all agencies to improve and coordinate their own activities /Hefferlin, p. 7/.

It would be the NCA's function to discourage the further proliferation of professional accrediting bodies and to stimulate the improvement of the standards and procedures of agencies already in operation (Mayor, 1965).

In 1965 the membership of the Commission was made up of the more than 1,200 institutional members of seven constituent associations: the American Association of Junior Colleges, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Universities, the Association of State Colleges and Universities, the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, the Association of Urban Universities, and the State Universities Association (National Commission on Accrediting, undated). Each of these constituent associations appoints six representatives (all presidents or chief administrative officers of member institutions) to the NCA governing body, the Board of Commissioners. The Commission has no legal authority over its member institutions; but it is expected that these colleges will deal only with accrediting agencies approved by the Commission, and they are bound by the constitution to "consult with and inform the Commission before undertaking action contrary to the rulings and recommendations of the Commission /National Commission on Accrediting, undated, no page/."

An NCA Advisory Committee to Study the Future Role of the National Commission reported in 1966 that the rapid growth of federal aid to higher education, and its impact on voluntary accrediting in the United States, was "perhaps the most crucial issue for accreditation in this decade /National Commission on Accrediting Reports, 1967, p. 14/." Despite a general pattern of federal recognition of established voluntary accreditation procedures as a basis upon which to allocate government funds, the expansion of federal support into even broader areas of higher education activity has become a source of considerable anxiety for the Commission.

Since the Korean War GI Bill (in 1952) institutions of higher education have had to be accredited by a nationally recognized agency to be eligible for participation in federal programs. The 1952 bill thus required that the U. S. Commissioner of Education maintain a public list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies and associations whose authority in the assessment of educational institutions and programs the government would accept (National Commission on Accrediting Reports, 1966). In some instances, it must be noted, the preparation of such an approved list has given the U. S. Commissioner discretion to choose between two nationally recognized agencies competing for jurisdiction in the same field or area. And as a result, the U. S. Commissioner's list has not agreed entirely with the list of approved accrediting agencies published by the NCA. The 1966 report of the Commission included the lists of the U. S. Commissioner and of the NCA, noting their agreement on 26 regional and professional accrediting agencies and their differences on a total of 13. As the basis upon which federal funds are, in fact, distributed, the U. S. Commissioner's independent listing is clearly a potential threat to the authority and legitimacy of the NCA in this area.

In addition, the 1965 amendments to the Nurse Training Act of 1964 gave the U. S. Office of Education authority to undertake for itself the accreditation of programs when it found no appropriate accrediting body available to do so (Cartter, 1966). While a subsequent agreement between the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the relevant accrediting organizations amended the breadth and significance of this option, it nevertheless raised a new challenge to the principle of voluntary accreditation in the United States, introducing, by one possible interpretation,

> . . .an incipient trend in the direction of substituting executive action where education [is] either too slow or incapable

> of acting in the public interest. It anticipates expanding Federal programs in areas of specialized training--especially at the semi- or sub-professional level--where traditional accreditation procedures are unlikely to suffice /pp. 64-65/.

As a result of these disturbing developments, the Advisory Committee to the NCA urged that the Commission give serious attention to the expanding activity of the federal government in areas related to accreditation, and that the NCA

> . . .should initiate and support strongly the primary responsibility of voluntary associations. Further, we recommend that the Commission explore a role for itself in connection with the determination of eligibility /for federal support/. We propose, as an example, that the Commission should nominate or have a voice in the selection of advisory committees aiding federal agencies in the determination of institutional eligibility. It also should explore means to become actively involved in the formulation of policies covering institutional eligibility. This can be done initially by its executive staff in Washington /p. 5/.

SUMMARY

The expansion of federal aid to higher education in the last three decades has come to touch directly upon the basic purposes and interests of higher education associations of all four types, stimulating them to develop (or to consider the development of) new organizational machinery for representing their interests to government. The distinction suggested above between four types of higher education associations makes it possible to differentiate among the specific areas of legislative interest which have begun to draw these various association types more actively into the federal policy process. This distinction also allows certain generalizations regarding the degree of politicization of higher education associations in the late 1960's.

Institutionally tied associations, which represent the institutional concerns of administrators in Washington, have been committed to promoting broad federal support for higher education and particular support of a type which preserves the autonomy and integrity of the university as an educational institution. Thus, institutionally tied associations have tended, for example, to promote: 1) institutional support for universities to counteract the fragmenting effects upon universities of categorical aid (and particularly of grant and contract research support in the scientific fields) and to allow academic administrators maximum responsibility for the allocation of funds within the institution; 2) an increase in federal support in previously "deprived" areas, such as the humanities, to bring better "balance" into university research programs; and 3) a reduction of the indirect cost to universities themselves of housing federally funded research projects, thus allowing for a concentration of university resources in areas which benefit least from federal support.

Discipline-oriented societies, on the other hand, are more narrowly concerned with assuring adequate federal support for research in specific fields and with preventing the passage of legislative measures which restrict research autonomy in specific fields of study as a condition of federal support.

The AAUP, the one faculty-oriented association described above, has tended to focus its attention on legislation threatening to restrict the work autonomy of all faculty members (or large groups of them) as a condition for participation in federal higher education programs. It has thus been active in opposing such legislative measures as disclaimer affidavits and loyalty oaths when these are appended to federal funds for research or other educational activities. In matters related to the defense of academic freedom, according to the report of the Self-Survey Committee (American Association of University Professors, 1965), the AAUP has been "in the forefront of organizational opposition /p. 17/."

The varied tasks performed by special task associations make it difficult to generalize broadly about the issues which tend (or promise) to involve these associations with the federal government. A number of these organizations, however, perform functions in the critical areas of educational testing and accrediting--areas in which higher education has been under particular pressure in recent years to develop voluntary procedures as a means of avoiding the establishment and enforcement of educational standards by the federal government. The NCA, for example, is vitally interested in that aspect of higher education legislation which specifies the basis upon which federal funds will be allocated to selected institutions and programs, for it is in determining the eligibility of colleges and universities and professional programs to receive federal funds that the government represents a potential threat to the American system of voluntary accreditation by private associations.

Given these basic differences in associational focus, historical patterns of federal aid to higher education (particularly during and since World War II) have been an important determinant of variations in the degree of politicization of the four association types.

As described in Chapter 2, the first massive wave of federal assistance to higher education in the 20th century took the form of support for academic science research during and immediately following World War II. The basic feature of government-university relations during this period was the system of grants and contracts through which specific science research projects were conducted on university campuses with federal government support. During the postwar years it was gradually to become apparent to university administrators, who played only a minimal role in setting up the grant and contract system, that this pattern of federal aid to science was, in fact, placing serious strains on the cohesion and integrity of the university as a broad educational institution. In their efforts to encourage wider support of university programs, however, academic administrators lacked the aura of technical expertise which had buttressed the authority of natural scientists as participants in the policy process. Government officials who considered themselves quite incapable of understanding the problems and needs of science were less reticent to consider and assess for themselves the technical problems of university administration. Even more importantly, however, legislation providing general aid to educational institutions was considerably more controversial in the 1940's and 1950's than was government support of science, with the consequence that major educational issues (in contrast to scientific ones) have long received close Congressional attention. The programs of institutional aid advocated by higher education administrators have also stimulated the active concern of a number of powerful nonacademic interest groups in the society (including the Chamber of Commerce, the AFL-CIO, and a number of national religious organizations) whose claims have frequently competed with those of academic administrators in the legislative arena.

As a result of the earlier need to represent and defend their policy views in Congress, and their lesser claim to technical expertise as advisors to government on the needs of higher education, university administrators began in the 1950's to establish a strong organizational position outside of government--through the establishment and politicization of institutionally tied associations in Washington--from which to enhance their role in the higher education policy process. By the middle 1960's, institutionally tied associations had formed the politically sophisticated higher education community in Washington, to which our attention will shortly turn.

Also involved with controversial educational policy in the 1950's and 1960's, and joining forces with institutionally tied associations when its own interests were touched by federal activity, was the faculty-oriented AAUP. For reasons which will be discussed in Chapter 6, however, the AAUP has remained somewhat aloof from the organized efforts of institutionally tied associations to promote broad federal support of academic institutions. And as a result, the AAUP has had a less persistent relationship with federal agencies and Congress than have the administrator-dominated organizations which make up the core of the Washington higher education community.

Discipline-oriented associations have, on the other hand, only recently begun to develop an organizational position outside of government from which to represent the needs of the scientific community to federal agencies and particularly to Congress. Social scientists (because of rising federal interest in social research) and natural scientists (because of a leveling off of funds for natural science projects) have begun to turn their attention in the 1960's to strengthening the role of many discipline-oriented associations as liaisons between the scientific disciplines and the national government.

For the one special task association described above --the National Commission on Accrediting--changes in federal policy in the 1960's have also created new legislative interests. In its attitude toward institutional accreditation by private educational organizations (as in its new mood regarding federal support of the natural sciences), Congress may, Cartter (1966) suggests, be beginning to question the legitimacy of self-regulation by professionals:

> Congress is beginning to show impatience in a variety of areas where it is the agent approving support but where it is relatively impotant in the administration of approved programs. This shows up in dissatisfactions over foreign policy, the defense establishment, AID programs, regulations concerning research grants and contracts, etc. It is also noticeable in the general attitude of Congress--itself largely made up of professional men--toward other professional groups whom it feels aspire to priviliged status. Accreditation is seen, consciously or unconsciously, as a means of establishing

> and protecting status. At its best, accrediting is a means of protecting the public, but at its worst, accrediting is a means of resisting change and exerting monopolistic power for self-aggrandizement. Two persons with whom the author discussed these attitudes mentioned the Medicare debates as a case in point, sensing that the professional ire of lawyers (who consider themselves servants) was raised against the professional attitude of those medical doctors who (they felt) put private position above the public good. Similar feelings are often raised against educators in general, the latter being pictured as individuals who want absolute independence coincident with free access to the public trough /p. 64/.

The implications of this charge in Congressional attitude for relations between science and government have been described at length above. For academicians concerned with accreditation, as well, this change creates a growing need to organize through associations such as the National Commission on Accrediting to defend the use of academic rather than governmental standards and criteria in the evaluation of educational institutions and programs.

V

Constraints on Political Activity

The broadening and deepening relationship between higher education and the national government has brought about proliferation of many kinds of linkages between these spheres. Views of academicians on educational policy are sought by federal officials and agencies through a growing variety of advisory posts, commissions and committees within government, and academic organizations outside of government. A central feature of the changing relations between higher education and government seems, nevertheless, to be enhanced importance of national voluntary associations as mechanisms for supplying extensive information needed by government, and for representing academic needs and interests to federal agencies and particularly to Congress.

Increasingly, as a result of developments in the 1960's, academicians must compete in Congress with powerful and well-organized nonacademic interests in promoting adequate support of higher education activities and defend these activities from what they perceive as undue restriction or control by legislators. Effective participation in the formulation of higher education policy thus requires considerable organization and political skill. As permanent structures with a continuity of executive staff in Washington, associations provide a unique organizational setting within which an understanding of the workings of government, and a familiarity with the complex Washington scene, can be accrued and used to advantage by representatives of the academic community. Since associations function independently of government, they also are able to monitor the broad range of governmental activity affecting higher education and to shift easily the focus of advisory and representative activities as the critical locus of federal programs, or of governmental decision making about these programs, changes.

The American Council on Education (undated, b), suggests that academic advice and assistance available from organizations independent of government gives academicians greater influence in determining who speaks to government for higher education. In the past:

> Federal agencies have often gone without advice or--perhaps more dangerously--have gone directly to individual advisors of their choice. Inevitably, the latter practice has on occasion become a device for getting what an agency wants to hear, rather than what it ought to hear. Enhancement of Council services in this area would be a major advance not only for higher education but also for the public interest /p. 21/.

Finally, associations perform diverse functions for their members and, thus, attract and represent a wide range of persons in the society, as they do in higher education. Broad membership gives them, in turn, unique access to widely dispersed sources of information and a capacity for mobilizing and coordinating the interests of large numbers of private citizens, and it makes them effective participants in political processes requiring the exercise of collective strength. However, significant constraints on the political activity of higher education associations have played an important part in shaping their role as representatives of the academic community.

MEMBERSHIP RETICENCE TO EXPAND CENTRAL OFFICE

Developing organizational machinery for dealing effectively with the federal government is time consuming and expensive. As the discussion of the ASA illustrates, a Washington office does not guarantee that association interests gain expression to government or to other private organizations in Washington. Monitoring innumerable federal programs which touch upon association concerns, and the establishment of working ties with countless agencies and committees which deal regularly with higher education policy, is a virtually unlimited task--and one which generally requires the attention of specialized association personnel. Like the addition of other association services, then, the development of political ties in Washington requires an expansion of central office staff and facilities at added expense to the dues-paying members. In addition to member reluctance to sustain these costs, however, there are further bases for resisting the growth of the central association office.

There is, first of all, a tendency for professional staff members--generally full-time, committed to association purposes, and closer than elected association leadership to the day-to-day operation of association affairs--to exercise considerable control over the functioning of the organization. Describing the position of the staff member in the civic association, Banfield and Wilson (1963) note, for example, that:

> by making recommendations as to who should be put on the board and "groomed for leadership," by "training" new board members to the organizational (i.e., staff) point of view, by selecting program material, by using "research" to influence policy, by writing speeches and press releases for uncritical and often uninterested officers and board members, the staff may--and indeed often must--play a principal part in deciding the association's character, style, and strategy [p. 253].

There has been considerable reticence among the members of many discipline-oriented associations, particularly, to allow a central staff to develop and to assume increasing responsibility for a broad range of organizational policies and activities, thus reducing the influence of the membership over association affairs.

This reticence is increased, in many instances, by internal divisions among the members of learned societies, which lead to anxiety on the part of each faction that a strong, well-organized central office might be "captured" by another group and used to enhance its control over the society's activities and objectives. Factions tend to develop, for example, along subdisciplinary lines, with each subdisciplinary group fearing the domination of the organization by members representing another branch of the discipline.

Geographical considerations also enter into intraorganizational disputes. Published reports of the American Sociological Association (Homans, 1964) refer, for example, to widespread anxiety on the part of society members that "the Association is dominated by an 'Eastern clique' among its officers [p. 895]." An inevitable concomitant of this suspicion is the concern among other regional groups that an expanded Washington office would provide a power base from which "Eastern" control could be more effectively exercised.

Thus, membership reluctance to develop strong organizational machinery within a central office must be seen, in some instances, as a conservative influence on the politicization process. It would seem, however, that where member interests are directly touched by federal activity (as this discussion of higher education associations has stressed), the pressure to develop machinery for representation in Washington becomes the more compelling force in determining association development.

THE TAX-EXEMPT STATUS OF EDUCATIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC ASSOCIATIONS

A more powerful source of restraint on the political activity of higher education associations in Washington can be found in the tax laws pertaining to their status as educational and scientific organizations.

Under Section 501(c)3 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended (Income Tax Regulations, 1967), "organizations organized and operated for religious, charitable, scientific, testing for public safety, literary, and educational purpose [p.33]" (including all the higher education associations considered here) retain a special tax-exempt status as long as they do not:

> (i). . .devote more than an insubstantial part of their activities to attempting to influence legislation by propaganda or otherwise; or (ii) directly or indirectly. . .participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of or in opposition to any candidate for public office /pp. 435-36/.

As long as educational and scientific organizations meet these statutory requirements, they are exempt from federal tax on their income, and contributions made to them are tax deductible for the contributors.* Just what constitutes a "substantial" part of an association's activities and what is meant by "attempting to influence legislation" remain somewhat ambiguous, however--making this statute a source of considerable anxiety for all tax-exempt organizations which deal directly with the government. For it is never entirely clear which of the diverse communications between associations and federal officials will be defined by the Internal Revenue Service to be attempts to influence legislation or when the participation of associations in the policy process will be taken to be a disproportionately large part of their work. Physics Today reported in 1967, for example, that many scientific societies were still reticent to "communicate with Congress" out of fear that it would jeopardize their tax-exempt status (Daddario urges societies, p. 83).

---

*Professional associations, on the other hand, are covered by Section 501(c)6 of the Internal Revenue Code, according to which they do not pay federal tax on their income, but contributions made to them are not tax deductible for contributors. Under this section of the tax code, there are no limitations placed on the political activity of professional societies.

Although educational and scientific societies in Washington are quick to point out that they are not lobbies and do not hire paid lobbyists, these terms are not, in fact, inconsistent with a tax-exempt status. The 1946 federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (Congressional Quarterly Service, 1965)

> . . .required any person who was hired by someone else for the principal purpose of lobbying Congress to register with the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House and file certain quarterly financial reports, so that his activities would be known to Congress and the public. Organizations which solicited or received money for the principal purpose of lobbying Congress did not necessarily have to register, but they did have to file quarterly spending reports with the Clerk detailing how much they spent to influence legislation /p. 6/.

NARROW VS. BROAD POLITICAL ISSUES

A crucial restraint on the political behavior of higher education associations relates to the range of political issues which these societies consider to be within their legitimate domain. While the boundaries of this domain cannot be

---

The term lobbying does not appear, however, in the section of the Internal Revenue Code pertaining to educational and scientific organizations. Such an organization might, that is, be a registered lobby and still qualify for tax-exempt status if no substantial part of its activities consists of attempting to influence legislation (United States House of Representatives, 1954).

The strong distaste among association personnel for the term lobby is not due, then, to tax considerations; nor does it reflect any desire on the part of scientific and educational associations to avoid public disclosure of their finances, since these associations publish annual statements of their financial status--usually in their own journals--for the information of their members and the general public. Antipathy toward being referred to as lobbies is due, rather, to the negative connotations of the term and to fear that its use will cast a bad light on association activities.

sharply defined, the behavior of many higher education associations in recent years testifies to the importance attributed by a majority of their members to limiting the scope of political issues with which such associations will become instrumentally involved.

A number of discipline-oriented associations (as well as the American Association of University Professors) have been confronted, for example, by internal pressures to involve them in issues of broad public policy relating to the problems of the society as a whole. While the response to these pressures has varied somewhat among different higher education associations, a significant pattern can be discerned in the examples below.

At the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association in August of 1967, just over 3 percent of the voting members of the Association submitted to the Council a resolution reading in part (Constitutional procedure, 1967):

> As human beings, citizens of the United States, and professional sociologists, we deplore and condemn the war in Vietnam as an undertaking which is resulting in the killing of innocent people and the destruction of a country and its culture /p. 223/.

Placing the matter before the total voting membership of the ASA, the Council voiced its own disapproval of the resolution, judging it inconsistent with the "professional neutrality" of the ASA as a "scientific and professional body." Accordingly, Association members were asked to vote by mail on two issues, their individual agreement or disagreement with the sentiments expressed in the proposal and their views as to whether the ASA should take an official position on the contents of the resolution. A 65 percent return on a mailed ballot yielded 1,472 votes of agreement with the Vietnam resolution and 1,247 votes opposed. The same members, however, voted 1,874 against the ASA taking an official position on Vietnam and only 989 in favor of an official organizational stance on the matter (Williams, 1968).

The efforts of American Physical Society members to involve the Society (and, indirectly, the American Institute of Physics) in broad social and political issues met with similar defeat. In 1967, a letter written by an APS member on the morality of the Vietnam war was rejected for publication by the editors of Physics Today, an American Institute of Physics journal. The basis for this rejection, the editors explained (Physics Today editors, 1967), was that "the American Institute of Physics and its publication Physics Today are by charter and intent devoted to physics as physics and physicists as physicists. The letter did not appear to have any special relation to either of them [p. 128]."

In the course of a subsequent debate (published by special arrangement in the "Letters" columns of Physics Today), an amendment to the APS constitution was proposed, which would allow Society members to vote on resolutions on "any matter of concern to the society" (the constitution of the APS limits society activities to "matters of direct professional concern to physicists [Mueller, 1968, p. 340]," and which would open Physics Today to the publication of member debates on questions of broad public policy. Fearing primarily (as a number of the published letters suggest) that the APS might be reduced to a debating society on controversial social issues, and that Physics Today would lose its essentially professional character if embroiled in issues not closely related to physics, APS members defeated the amendment by a vote of 9,214 to 3,553, with just over half of the Society's 24,000 members voting (Sullivan, 1968). In strong opposition to publishing debates on Vietnam in Physics Today or other AIP journals was the president of the National Academy of Sciences, Fredrich Seitz (1968), who wrote:

> It seems to me that it would be a great mistake for the American Institute of Physics, or the member societies, to be involved in such controversial matters unless they are tied very immediately to the profession of physics itself . . . [although] I wish to emphasize that I see no reason why Physics Today could not be used for comments on social or economic issues immediately related to our profession [p. 17].

3

At their fall meeting in 1967, members of the American Political Science Association (APSA) formed a new group within the Association called The Caucus for a New Political Science. Protesting the apparent conviction of the officers of the APSA that "major partisan issues of the day lay beyond the proper professional concerns of the Association," the Caucus resolved to "promote a new concern in the Association for our great social crises and a new and broader opportunity for us all to fulfill, as scholars, our obligations to society and to science /Bayer, 1968, pp. 38-39/." During the period of the fall convention, the Caucus achieved a membership of 225 (out of an APSA membership of approximately 14,000 in 1967, according to figures obtained from the APSA Executive Office) and adopted a number of resolutions. In addition to laying plans for a meeting of its own to occur in conjunction with the APSA convention in 1968, the Caucus appealed to the APSA Program Committee to schedule a full day of Association meetings for discussion on the Vietnam war. It also requested of Association officers that the full membership be polled regarding its views on the Vietnam war. Both requests were subsequently refused (Bayer, 1968). Finally, the Executive Committee of the Caucus announced that it would propose an amendment to the APSA constitution which would "broaden permanently the concerns of the Association for contemporary political life /p. 39/."

As a subgrouping dedicated, at least in part, to promoting the study by political scientists of current, critical political problems, the Caucus represents in two ways an intermediate solution to the problem of association involvement in broad politics: It retains an emphasis on research, with a stated commitment to maintaining "academic detachment and scholarly standards" in the study of contemporary issues (Bayer, 1968); and it makes possible the discussion, within the Association, of controversial issues on which the total APSA membership may or may not choose to take an official (organizational) stand.

The distinction between broad, or widely ramifying, political and social issues and those relating directly to the fundamental interests of scientific and educational associations is, of course, not always clear. An official position on the problem of war was adopted by the American

Anthropological Association (AAA) a number of years ago, for example, and was recently reaffirmed by the AAA Council as an appropriate expression of a central professional concern of anthropologists.

The Council of the AAA adopted by acclamation, in 1961, a resolution put before it by Margaret Mead on "The Use of Anthropology (Official reports, 1962)," reading, in part:

> Whereas as anthropologists we recognize that mankind, a single interconnected biological species, is now threatened with the possibility of extinction through the methods and preparations of modern warfare--nuclear, biological and chemical. . .and that mankind is now faced with an entirely new problem of survival. . . and that at this crossroads it is urgently necessary that the full resources of our science, of related human sciences, and of the whole scientific community be brought to bear on the easing of the immediate crisis and the development of social institutions which will enable all peoples to live and work, however great their differences.
>
> Be it therefore resolved,
>
> 1) That to this task we devote our scientific resources as anthropologists, in cooperation with other /American and international science organizations/. . .
> 2) That we call upon our governmental bodies--federal, state, and local--to make fuller use of anthropology and other human sciences in pursuit of our stated national policy of the search for disarmament and the search for peace /p. 61/.

At a Council meeting held in November of 1966, an additional resolution--relating directly to the Vietnam war--was adopted "by two-thirds to three-quarters of those voting (Official reports, 1967)." It read, in part:

> Reaffirming our 1961 resolution, we condemn the use of napalm, chemical defoliants. . .and the intentional or deliberate policies of genocide or forced transportation of populations for the

> purpose of terminating their cultural and/or genetic heritages by anyone anywhere.
>
> These methods of warfare deeply offend human nature. We ask that all governments put an end to their use at once and proceed as rapidly as possible to a peaceful settlement of the war in Vietnam /p. 383/.

Although an earlier motion to table this resolution was defeated by only a narrow margin, the Official report of the meeting mentioned no discussion among Council members as to the appropriateness of an official AAA position on the Vietnam war.

One potential danger of embroiling associations in broad political issues is described by the Self-Survey Committee of the American Association of University Professors (1965):

> The representatives of the Association frequently have difficulty enough in coming to an agreement on matters of direct professional concern. To take positions on more sweeping and controversial matters might tend to divide the membership even more sharply and unnecessarily. Since there is no position with regard to an important and controversial public issue around which the entire membership of the Association would be at all likely to agree, any position-taking in such areas would tend to alienate some persons /p. 181/.

An association is, as Rose (1967) has stressed, an organization of limited purposes--those specific purposes which originally brought its members together. The fact that association members share one interest in common in no way assures that they share other interests or attitudes as well; attempts to draw an association into activity in areas different from the original concerns of its members can seriously threaten the cohesion of the organization.

The fear of alienating a minority of members on issues such as Vietnam does not seem as critical a factor in determining the behavior of disciplinary associations, however, as the reluctance on the part of a majority of association members to commit their organizations to broad political causes which they define as being outside the basic purposes of these organizations. On the one hand, those scholars committed to the employment of disciplinary associations as vehicles for socio-political activism argue, as the above examples illustrate, that to avoid association involvement in broad and controversial political issues is to neglect the fundamental obligation of their disciplines to society as well as to science. On the other hand, those members of the disciplines who defend a narrower political role for their professional associations fear that involving them actively in broad political affairs will attenuate the commitment of these organizations to professional standards of scholarship and the development of knowledge. Such involvement also threatens to undermine the professional legitimacy of the association, they argue, in the eyes of the public and of government officials--reducing the potential effectiveness of the association in the pursuit of goals more closely related to its traditional scholarly purposes. Notably, the expansion of association activity to include advocacy to government of narrower disciplinary interests does not seem to raise similar intraorganizational controversy or to lie outside of the basic purposes of disciplinary associations as these purposes are defined by a majority of association members.

Babbidge and Rosenzweig (1962) provide an example of the way in which association representatives to government --and particularly to Congress--may fail to play an effective role as advocates of narrow higher education interests as a result of overzealous and unsolicited efforts to solve broader problems of public policy. Describing the efforts of university presidents (through their Washington-based associations) to win federal support for the needs and purposes of their institutions (1960), these authors lament:

> . . .when they debated the possibility of aid to higher education, they were not content to describe their needs and the most effective

> manner of meeting them; instead, they took on the larger issue, whether it would constitute sound public policy to meet these needs. They did not argue over their needs and interests; they argued over a broad question of public policy, in this instance, the so-called Church-State issue /p. 11/.

And Rosenzweig (1965) adds:

> The general tendency of these administrators to try to say too much has been detrimental to their cause. In many cases, it seems to me, college presidents (and it is almost always the presidents who are involved in these matters) have leaned over backwards to tackle an issue of public policy which they could and from a political standpoint, probably should have avoided. . .and their voluntary pronouncements immensely complicated their legislative efforts. . .There is a genuine conflict between the role which they seek for themselves as educational statesmen and their role as political operators lobbying on behalf of higher education /pp. 60-61/.

Similarly, the failure to distinguish between broad political matters (which touch upon the welfare of the nation as much as upon the interests of any particular organization) and the narrower sphere of paramount association concerns is exemplified in the opposition of the American Medical Association (AMA) to Medicare legislation. Here, a desire to protect the professional autonomy and monetary advantage of doctors led their Association to advocate strongly its views on American democracy and the free enterprise system--with the end result, it has been argued, that the AMA was both ineffective in preventing the passage of Medicare and unable to participate in the technical design of this medical legislation, even when called upon by Congress to do so.

As the House Ways and Means Committee prepared in the spring of 1965 to devise a Medicare bill, Richard Harris (1966) stated, "Its members wanted, and needed, all the expert assistance they could get on the complicated technical problems involved [p. 184]." Inviting witnesses to appear before an executive session of the Committee, Chairman Mills requested specifically that they confine their testimony to the sphere of their particular professional competence. Representatives of the AMA, however, spoke at considerable length "about economics, sociology, public welfare, and the Social Security system," contributing (in the words of one Committee member) "absolutely nothing constructive [p. 184]" to the formulation of the bill at hand. One Representative was finally driven to remark: "I am only sorry that we must proceed in the writing of this bill without the technical assistance that your organization might have given us [p. 185]."

While the example is, indeed, extreme, it illustrates a potential disadvantage of active association involvement in broad political problems _if_ the organization seeks, at the same time, to be effective in representing its members, as a group with specific expertise and particular interests, to the government and to the public. This is not to suggest that an association should not enter into broad political questions which its members define as being directly related to the basic objectives of the organization. It does point up, however, the necessity to distinguish as carefully as possible between broad and narrow political issues where an association seeks to maximize its influence in areas of recognized member competence and special association concern.

Many members of the academic disciplines feel a growing professional obligation to play an active role in the solution of broad public problems; and the enhanced size, visibility, and prestige of the academic professions in the 1960's has contributed to the desire on the part of these academicians to employ the status and authority of their professional voluntary organizations in support of their wide-ranging social and political views. Thus, academic concern for such issues as the war in Vietnam will undoubtedly continue to seek expression in the organizational context of higher education associations, and particularly within the discipline-oriented associations--the organizations with which academic scholars most directly identify. The tension between the forces for narrow politicization and the forces for broad politicization of discipline-oriented associations will thus almost certainly intensify in future years.

VI

Decision Making in a Coalitional Context

Two contrasting remarks by United States Senators suggest that important changes have occurred in the national organization of higher education within the last decade and that these changes have come about with encouragement from educationally oriented members of Congress. Addressing representatives of higher education associations during the 1960 hearings on College Aid legislation (U. S. Senate, 1960), Senator Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania admonished:

> I am somewhat disappointed. . .that despite the fact that the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School made its report over three years ago, there is still no unanimity among the agencies representing our higher education institutions as to what kind of help they want from the Federal Government. They all know they want help, but they can't agree on what form it should take. I hope that conflict will shortly be resolved [p. 52].

In hearings on the Higher Education Amendments of 1966 (U. S. Senate, 1966), Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon said:

> If one were to ask me to name the one major reason why we have been able in recent years to have [a] breakthrough in education legislation--with the result that since the first year of the Kennedy administration we have

> passed more Federal aid to educational legislation quantatively and qualitatively than has been passed in the preceding 100 years. . .I would tell you that it is because at long last the educational segment of our country moved forward as a united body in support of all the various pieces of education legislation. . . . Lacking this unity of approach. . .I did not see much optimism for federal aid to education. To the everlasting credit of the profession they united and we were able to get the legislation passed /p. 188/.

An important aspect of this new unity of effort is the development during the 1960's of an effective pattern of communication and alliance among institutionally tied higher education associations on the national level. This chapter will describe these patterns, their emergence in the 1960's, and their implications for higher education-federal government relations.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Warren (1967) suggested a typology of contexts in which organizational units interact in making decisions, basing these types on differences in the relationship of the participating units to an inclusive decision-making structure. The four contexts are: 1) a unitary context in which the organizational units are formally organized for the achievement of inclusive goals, with final authority over the units residing at the top of the structure. In this context

> norms call for a high commitment to following the orders of a leadership subsystem. The units are expected to orient their behavior toward the well-being of the inclusive organization rather than toward their own respective subgoals /p. 404/.

2) A *federative context* for decision making, in which the units are member organizations, rather than departments of a unitary structure, and retain individual goals while cooperating toward the achievement of certain inclusive goals. An inclusive structure provides formal machinery for decision making and for the accomplishment of established goals, but authority (to ratify inclusive decisions) resides in the participating units themselves. Moderate commitment to the inclusive organization is expected, though norms allow for "considerable unit autonomy." 3) A *coalitional context* for inclusive decision making within which organizations having their own goals collaborate "informally and on an *ad hoc* basis where some of [their] goals are similar to those of other organizations in the group [p. 405]," but in which there is no formal machinery for inclusive decision making. Decision making occurs, rather, in the informal interaction among units. In this context,

> there is only a minimal prescription of collectivity orientation by the units, it being understood that the units are concerned primarily with their own goals, and only secondarily with the loose interactional structure in which they happen to be collaborating [p. 405].

4) A *social choice* context in which decisions are made independently by autonomous units which do not necessarily share any inclusive goals. Their goals may, in fact, be in conflict. There is no formal structure for inclusive decision making, and no expectation of commitment to collective ends.

In two of these contexts (the federative and the coalitional), then, inclusive decision making and the pursuit of inclusive goals occur voluntarily, in the absence of bureaucratic (hierarchical) authority, among organizational units whose general missions remain in partial conflict. If the values and goals of these units were entirely consistent, there would be no purpose in their remaining separate and autonomous organizations (Litwak and Hylton, 1962). Among organizationally tied higher education associations in Washington, inclusive decision making and cooperation in the pursuit of common objectives have occured in the 1960's in an essentially *coalitional context*. Collaboration among these organizations is largely informal, and on an *ad hoc* basis.

Although the key participants in national decision making processes are listed among the constituent organization members of the American Council on Education, this membership carries with it little formal authority over the policy or programs of the ACE, and the ACE does not provide (as would the inclusive structure in a *federative context*) formal organization and staff for inclusive decision making. Rather, decision making among higher education associations takes place through interaction among the units themselves, with each of the participating organizations (including the ACE) committed *primarily* to the goals established by its own institutional members and *secondarily* to the reconciliation of these goals to the objectives of other higher education associations and to collaboration in realizing common ends.

Reorganization of the ACE

As part of a thoroughgoing reorganization of the ACE in 1962 (American Council on Education, undated, b), the major governing body of the association was expanded from an Executive Committee of nine, with limited authority to act for the Council without the direct approval of the institutional membership, to a Board of 24 Directors, made up almost entirely of representatives of member institutions. The Board was given a mandate to act in the conduct of Council business in their "own best judgment as. . . individual[s] in the interests of higher education as a whole[p. 8]." With the creation of this Board, the prestige of university and college presidents was employed to enhance the national status and leadership role of the Council through the incorporation of a large number of institutional chief executives into its leadership ranks.

This reorganization marked the culmination of a gradual trend away from formal control over Council policies by the constituent organizations which founded it in 1918 and toward the determination of policy by the Council's large and influential institutional membership. Other steps were taken at the same time to "give the most influential national [higher education] organizations a larger responsibility for Council operations [p. 5]," essentially by establishing Group A and Group B categories of organizational membership and providing that the more important Group A constituent members might,"according to the ACE Constitution, on request of a majority. . .hold meetings for the purpose of making policy recommendations through the President [of ACE] to the Board of Directors." Nevertheless,the total effect of the reorganization was (according to the staff members of a number of Group A constituent associations) to increase the responsiveness of the ACE to its institutional members rather than to its constituent members in the determination of Council policy and behavior. In responding to its institutional members, the executive director of another higher education association (Thackrey, 1965) has written, the Council has in fact "become competitive with the constituency which it also wishes to coordinate [p. 24]."

Nevertheless, the ACE does hold as one of its paramount organizational missions the coordination of organizationally tied associations in their efforts to deal with national educational problems and in their relationships with the federal government. And this mission was strengthened in 1962 with the determination of the ACE leadership to play a more aggressive role as spokesman for the higher education community to government. The Council's president (Logan Wilson, 1962) asserted:

> Although I agree with our Executive Committee that it would be a mistake for us to become

> an action or lobbying organization as distinguished from one engaged in broader pursuits, I am of the opinion that we have an obligation to influence educational developments in the right direction. Whether we like it or not, this involves a closer and more effective liaison between educational leaders and key figures in the legislative and executive branches of government. Neither higher education nor the government is well served when the representations being made come mainly from special interest groups which often are either ignorant of or indifferent to total needs and the priorities implicit in them [p. 18].

In an effort to educate governmental decision makers more effectively as to the needs of higher education, the Council set out to fashion greater consensus in the policy desires of higher education institutions and of the various associations representing them in Washington and to articulate these desires to Congress and the Executive. In the process it has acted both as a coordinative and representative structure and, like each of its constituent organization members, as an organization committed to its own set of goals and objectives.

MEMBERS OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION COMMUNITY IN WASHINGTON

Those associations which have been most closely involved with the ACE since 1962, in an effort to achieve a more effective voice in federal higher education policy, have been the seven Washington-based organizations included in Group A of the ACE's constituent membership (the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, the Association of State Colleges and Universities, the Association of American Universities, the Association of American Colleges, the Council of Protestant Colleges and

Universities, the National Catholic Educational Association, and the American Association of Junior Colleges--two additional Group A members, the Association of Urban Universities and the Jesuit Education Association, have their headquarters in cities other than Washington and are therefore somewhat peripheral to the functioning of the higher education community in the Capital); five organizations having Group B constituent membership status in the ACE (the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the American Association of University Professors, the National Commission on Accrediting, the National Association of College and University Business Officers, and the Council of Graduate Schools); and one organizational affiliate of the National Education Association having no membership in ACE (the American Association for Higher Education).

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC)

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (which has been described at some length in Chapter 4) has the longest record of any of ACE's Group A members in dealing with the federal government, and it was one of the fourteen founding organizations which made up the original constituent membership of the Council. The 99 institutional members of the NASULGC are major colleges and universities in their respective states, and the long history of the Association in representing them to the federal government has made it one of the most influential educational organizations on the national level.

As is the case with the other associations described below, the NASULGC often accepts, and occasionally seeks, invitations to testify before Congress on educational legislation, alone or in concert with other higher education associations. Such testimony is often arranged and may even be prepared by executive officers of the association who are well-informed in the area of federal relations; but testimony is almost always presented to Congress by presidents of member institutions who are invited to Washington to speak for the Association. (Because the chief executive officers of the organizationally tied associations are among the most knowledgeable members of the higher education community on both educational legislation and association policy, it is not uncommon for an executive officer to accompany a visiting university president to Congressional hearings to provide any information which that president is unable to provide. A considerable effort is made, however, to see that presidents called upon to testify for an association are well informed before they make a Congressional appearance.)

The NASULGC has been a strong advocate of unity among organizationally tied associations if they are to have an impact on federal higher education policy, and it has made a consistent effort to support cooperation among these organizations in Washington. One significant indication of this effort has been the unwillingness of Association leadership (representing public institutions) to alienate organizations representing private colleges and universities by openly opposing federal aid to private schools. Although some individual representatives to the Association are inevitably opposed to government support of private institutions, it has been a consistent NASULGC policy to come out neither for nor against such aid. Thus, while supporting legislation of benefit to its own members, the NASULGC has managed not to exacerbate one of the potentially more devisive issues within the higher education community (Pettit, 1965).

At the same time, the Association has actively promoted the role of the ACE as the primary spokesman for higher education organizations to government, attempting to reconcile its own policy views with those of the ACE wherever possible, to testify before Congress in conjunction with ACE representatives on issues of mutual interest, and in some instances to speak through the ACE. An example of such cooperative effort (on the part of the NASULGC as well as of other higher education organizations) is provided below in the discussion of the Higher Education Acts of 1963 and 1965.

While the NASULGC has shown itself willing to compromise on some legislative issues and not on others (as the discussion of recent legislation will demonstrate), its representation of public institutions of higher learning is reflected in its outspoken commitment to federal assistance for the "second twenty" institutions in the United States and its promotion of the kind of support for public institutions which would enable them to keep down tuition costs for students, thus making them more competitive with the top private schools in the country in their ability to attract good students. Along the same lines, the Association has opposed scholarship aid which would allow student recipients of federal funds to concentrate themselves in the top educational institutions, "making the rich richer" and bypassing the less prestigious state and land grant institutions. While generally opposed to scholarships as a form of federal assistance to higher education, the Association has advocated that any federal support for students at least be administered by the educational institutions themselves (as are NDEA fellowships), making them a source of attraction for talented students to a broader range of colleges and universities (Pettit, 1965).

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU)

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities was established in 1961 to represent the interests of four-year wholly or partially state-supported and state-controlled institutions of higher learning. Many of its approximately 200 member institutions were formerly teachers colleges (and members of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education) which have since become multipurpose institutions.

A year after the AASCU's founding, a central office was established in the ACE building in Washington, D.C., where the Association staff has maintained a close working relationship with the National

Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. An AASCU representative has explained:

> On the national level, the interests of land-grant institutions and other state colleges and universities are the same. On the state level, of course, these same institutions compete with each other directly in the state legislatures, and are in conflict over their respective roles in a state higher education system. But there is much less disagreement among them nationally than there is locally.

In 1967, the AASCU and the NASULGC held their annual meetings jointly and subsequently issued a joint statement (described in Chapter 4), entitled Recommendations for national action affecting higher education (National Association of State Universities, 1967). Strong among their recommendations was, "expanded institutional support [which] would help put a brake on rising tuition charges and reduce the need for additional federally-supported student financial aid programs [p. 9]."

At their joint meetings, however, the AASCU and the NASULGC agreed to disagree on the question of federal aid to private institutions. While the AASCU (Court review, 1966) "approved a resolution encouraging Congress to provide for judicial review on existing Federal aid legislation that covers private colleges, including those with religious affiliations [p. B6]," the NASULGC took no similar action, but reaffirmed its position in support of federal assistance for all institutions.

The AASCU has also cooperated closely with the ACE since the establishment of its Washington office in 1962. While the Association has occasionally offered supplementary testimony in support of legislation in which the ACE was not directly interested, it has generally testified in conjunction with representatives from the ACE, or has been represented by them to Congress.

The Association of American Universities (AAU)

The membership of the Association of American Universities is limited to 40 of the most prestigious universities in the United States (20 of them private and 20 public) and two in Canada. Presidents of these member institutions meet twice a year to discuss privately among themselves (in closed meetings with no printed proceedings) the common concerns of university chief executives. According to a Statement on federal relations issued by the AAU in 1963, these 42 institutions "have associated themselves because of their common interest in the promotion of excellence in graduate education and research /p. 1/."

Although the Association established an office and a small staff in Washington in the early 1960's, it is not an activist organization in the federal arena, and it relies upon the ACE to represent its members in federal affairs. Not only does the Association attempt to avoid giving Congressional testimony, but it rarely takes a public stand on educational issues and problems. A spokesman explained that

> There is a tendency in AAU to believe you can exhaust yourself by testifying too much. If you do speak out too much, you are not listened to. While some higher education associations take a position on everything, the AAU prefers not to exhaust its leverage by speaking out on too many issues.

Occasionally, however, the Association does come out with a policy statement, as it did in 1953 and again in 1963. The latter was the Statement on federal relations which urged "the continuation of a policy of selective, rather than general, /federal/ support" of higher education on the grounds that

> . . .programs of general operating support of universities by the federal government would eventually lead to the erosion of the independence and diversity of our

> institutions of higher education, and transfer a substantial influence on university academic programs from the institutions. . .to government agencies /p. 6/.

Within this framework of selective general aid, the AAU advocated widening the range of university activities supported, and it called upon the government to reduce the cost to the university itself of federally funded programs /pp. 5-8/. In line with AAU policy, however, no representatives of the Association had testified before Congress in support of these recommendations by early 1968.

The Association of American Colleges (AAC)

The Association of American Colleges was founded in 1915 to promote higher education in colleges of liberal arts and sciences. Its nearly 900 member institutions are highly varied in size as well as in sources of control and support, but well over half are small, independent or church-related colleges, and there is a concerted effort within the association to put representatives of small institutions on the Board of Directors and on the various AAC commissions. The AAC has been preoccupied in recent years with defining the place and function of the undergraduate college in modern higher education.

Until the 1950's, the AAC was mainly an organization of small private, church-related institutions with a distinctively conservative view toward federal participation in higher education. Opposition among these institutions toward federal assistance was based in part upon a fear of federal control, but also involved was the church-state issue. Many strongly opposed the allocation of federal funds to church-related institutions.

During the 1950's, however, the Association expanded to include state teachers colleges which were becoming multipurpose institutions and which were less reluctant about receiving federal funds. (AAC membership presently includes about two-thirds of the 1960 members of the NASULGC and a sizable number of AASCU members.) Gradually, over the objection of a small group of Protestant and independent colleges which has continued into the 1960's to oppose federal aid, the Association has assumed a position in favor of government aid to colleges and universities.

The AAC's Commission on Legislation (subsumed in 1965 under the broader Commission on College and Society as the Committee on Government Relations) has strongly supported recent educational legislation, and its advocacy has generally been conveyed to government by the ACE. One staff member asserted:

> Our policy outlooks are so similar to those of the ACE that we have no need for a separate voice on educational legislation. Besides, there are enough associations speaking with separate voices already in Washington.

In 1965, for example, Vice-President Wormald of the AAC wrote to Representative Edith Green of Oregon:

> Having considered the statement published by the American Council of Education under the title "Commitment to Expanding Opportunity," our board of directors decided it was generally acceptable as a statement of the association's own policies and that, at any rate so far as the higher education bill was concerned, it was not necessary for us to take up the time of your committee by offering separate oral testimony /p. 872/.

But although AAC leadership (both executive and elected officers) is firmly committed to cooperation with the ACE and its constituent organizations in their relations with the federal government, the diverse membership of the AAC has not consistently supported this effort to present a united front to the government.

In 1964, for instance, when the Legislative Commission of the Association proposed withdrawing the Association's endorsement of tax credit legislation* to bring the position of the AAC into line with that of the ACE on this issue, AAC members voted instead to continue the AAC's support of tax credits--in public opposition to the position of the ACE as well as that of the NASULGC. This action, as Pettit (1965) indicates, was brought about by a conservative minority within the Association, and "suggests the tenuousness with which the leadership must operate in attempting to fashion overall policy objectives that allow the organization to coalesce with other higher education groups [p. 205]."

Although there has been little effort on the part of the Association to actively promote such legislation, the AAC was still on record, in 1966, in support of tax credits. And according to one Association staff member, there is still much pressure from members of AAC to take a more independent stand from that of the ACE. Thus, the efforts of AAC representatives to maintain unity with other higher education associations in Washington have had to overcome resistance from a persistent minority of Association members.

---

*Tax credit legislation would give tax relief to the parents of college students and has been viewed openly by private colleges as a device which would allow them to raise tuition levels. It has been strongly advocated by many private institutions as a form of indirect institutional support which would not raise the controversial church-state and public-private issues. It has been opposed, on the other hand, by organizations representing public institutions (such as the NASULGC), on the grounds that it would benefit most those parents who need it least (those who can send their children to high-tuition private schools), and, as a large depletion of tax funds, would jeopardize broader legislative measures providing more equitable federal support for all types of institutions.

The Council of Protestant Colleges and Universities (CPCU)

The Council of Protestant Colleges and Universities was founded in 1959 "to increase the significance of the contribution of the Protestant church-related colleges to the total pattern of American higher education and to develop services to these institutions /Encyclopedia of associations, 1968/." By 1966, Council membership included more than 230 Protestant institutions, many of which are members, as well, of the Association of American Colleges. In fact, the CPCU, in 1963, established its headquarters at the same address as the AAC office in Washington.

In that same year the president-elect of the Council, representing the most conservative of the AAC presidents as well as the membership of CPCU, testified before Congress as part of a panel strongly opposing federal aid to higher education in general and the higher education bill in particular, and supporting tax credits (Pettit, 1965). Since 1963, however, the CPCU has become less active in its interest in tax credit legislation and has become an open advocate of direct federal aid to church-related schools, bringing its position much more closely into line with the present commitment of the AAC and the ACE.

The National Catholic Educational Association (NCEA)

The National Catholic Educational Association was founded in 1904 to promote, most generally, the welfare of Catholic education (National Catholic Educational Association, undated). While its primary concern is elementary-secondary education, the Association is represented in its relationship to the ACE by the Associate Secretary of its College and University Department, located (as are the offices of all seven of the NCEA's departments) in the quarters of the ACE in Washington.

Membership in the College and University Department of the NCEA overlaps considerably with the memberships of both the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, reducing the need for the NCEA to represent its member institutions actively in the Washington context and allowing the department staff to concentrate on educational programs and problems of curriculum. In addition, the "church position" on higher education (and other federal) legislation is frequently articulated to government by the broader purpose National Catholic Welfare Conference. Thus, the NCEA has not testified before Congress in recent years but has allowed its Congressional relations to be handled by the ACE as well as the NCWC.

The American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC)

Founded in 1920, the American Association of Junior Colleges had come by 1966 to represent more than 600 of an estimated total of 800 junior colleges in existence in the United States in that year, and its Washington headquarters staff had expanded to include 12 professionals. It is the only association organized specifically for the purpose of representing junior college interests on the national level.

The Association's Commissions on Administration, Curriculum, Instruction, and Student Personnel attempt to stimulate and direct the development of junior college programs in the United States. In addition, a Commission on Legislation has concerned itself with the role of national, state, and local governments in the support of junior colleges. Responding to the growing potential for federal aid to undergraduate education in the middle 1960's, the Commission on Legislation was instrumental in bringing about the establishment, in 1965, of an AAJC federal relations office under a full-time director of governmental relations. Supported on a voluntary basis by member colleges, this office assumed the task of monitoring and interpreting legislative activity with an eye to its relevance for the two-year college, and the office also began publication of a regular Federal Affairs Bulletin to keep its members informed (American Association of Junior Colleges, 1965).

More than most national higher education associations, the AAJC has a sense of special mission in Washington as interpreter to government, to the public, and to other educational organizations, of the "true objectives and purposes of the junior college education and the social forces which have brought it into being in the Twentieth Century [Beckes, 1965-66, p. 1]." Protesting that junior colleges have been excluded from many programs of federal aid for education (such as the extensive programs supporting graduate and research activity since World War II), the AAJC has launched a vigorous campaign to educate government officials regarding the unique and vital function of the junior college in the American educational system and to remind Congressmen, in addition, that in most Congressional districts there is at least one junior college. An Association staff member explained:

> Part of the AAJC perspective is shaped by the fact that junior colleges have had to battle uphill for many years in the states to get money from state legislatures, and the membership feels strongly that battling for funds is the right and proper way to be represented nationally also.

This agressive approach to cultivating friends on Capitol Hill has been particularly successful because of the natural appeal of the community-and business-oriented junior college to members of Congress.

Part of the uphill battle for the AAJC has been a gradual struggle for status within the higher education community. Having long felt that its purposes were not adequately understood or respected by organizations representing four-year institutions and graduate schools, the AAJC argues that unenthusiastic support from other associations for aid to junior colleges has been partially responsible for the relative neglect of these institutions in the past in the allocation of federal funds. The growing political weight and sophistication of the AAJC in the 1960's has heightened the importance of this organization in the higher education community, however, and has raised the problem of its loyalty and commitment to other higher education associations. While the AAJC has been willing, on numerous occasions, to testify jointly with the ACE in support of educational legislation containing junior college provisions, it has testified, as well, on behalf of its own special legislative needs, and it continues to go before Congress independently when it perceives some advantage in doing so. Such unilateral efforts are a source of consternation to other associations in the higher education community, and particularly to the ACE, as later discussion will illustrate.

The American Association for Higher Education (AAHE)

The American Association for Higher Education is the only national higher education association which offers individual membership to faculty members and administrators alike. Named the Association for Higher Education until 1967, it has a membership of about 23,500 individuals from 1600 colleges and universities (both public and private) in the United States and in 24 foreign countries (Association for Higher Education, undated). For many years a self-governing department of the National Education Association, the AAHE has recently taken steps to enhance its autonomy through the adoption of "Associated Organization" (rather than departmental) status within the NEA.

This new status will allow the AAHE almost complete independence in framing its own constitution and policies.

The Association is

> . . .concerned with the full range of issues and developments in higher education. . . [and] provides a national forum through which representative thinkers can voice views on critical problems concerning higher education [no page].

For a number of years, this organization has maintained a close relationship with Congress and governmental agencies as an advocate of broader federal aid to colleges and universities and of scholarships for both graduate and undergraduate students (Quattlebaum, 1960).

Though not an organization representing institutions as such, the AAHE has been included in the important activities of the higher education community of organizationally tied associations, primarily, several informants suggested, because of the long tenure and considerable political expertise of its Executive Secretary on the Washington scene. A participant in all major policy decisions among higher education associations, this AAHE representative has worked closely with the ACE and has actively supported association efforts to present a united front to government on questions of higher education legislation.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE)

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, like the AAHE, is an autonomous department of the National Education Association. But it is a Group B constituent member of the ACE as well. Its primary purpose is improvement of teacher preparation, and its members include more than 700 public and private colleges and universities offering major teacher education programs. Over half the members of this organization are also members of the Association of American Colleges, and membership overlap with other organizationally tied associations--particularly the American

Association of State Colleges and Universities--is also considerable, In many instances, teachers colleges which have become multipurpose institutions join other associations such as the AAC and the ASCU and retain their affiliation with the AACTE, sending their deans of education to represent them in the affairs of this Association. Thus, while other organizations now represent the institutions (as whole institutions) on the national level, the AACTE has come to concentrate exclusively on problems of higher education.

The AACTE has testified before Congress--largely on technical problems of educational legislation--but has attempted to avoid public testimony on controversial problems such as the church-state issue. For the most part, it has allowed other organizationally tied associations to represent its member institutions in the political sphere.

The Committee on Governmental Relations of the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO)

The Committee on Governmental Relations of the National Association of College and University Business Officers developed out of the need of higher education institutions and federal agencies, following World War II, for technical advice and information concerning the financial aspects of government-university relations. A Committee office with a full-time Executive Director was established in the ACE quarters in Washington in 1960.

Composed of nineteen members (all appointed by the president of the NACUBO) who are primarily senior business officers of higher education institutions, the Committee meets about seven times a year to discuss important problems in the fiscal relationships between the government and higher education. Its interests in recent years have included patent policies, NDEA loan administration, and the indirect costs to universities of federal aid. When such issues are of broad import in the higher education sphere, senior staff members of the ACE are invited to join in Committee discussions, as are representatives of government agencies when the topic is appropriate (National Association of College and University Business Officers, undated). The Committee has appeared before Congressional committees or has prepared statements for such committees upon invitation. "Its activities in relation to legislation are in support of the American Council on Education, for which it provides technical assistance in the business field /National Association of College and University Business Officers, undated, p. 4/."

The Committee is supported by more than 70 institutions to which it reports the results of its analyses of educational legislation. It does not, however, represent the interests of these particular institutions to the government or become involved in controversial questions regarding federal aid. The mission of the Committee in Washington is, rather, to act as a technical consultative body for the ACE and for government agencies and Congress. In this capacity, the Committee has worked closely with the ACE's Commission on Federal Relations.

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP)

Like the American Association for Higher Education, the AAUP represents individual members of the academic community rather than institutions, and to some extent the AAHE and the AAUP compete for membership and share similar concerns--a major focus of both organizations being the improvement of higher education. The more homogeneous membership of the AAUP, however, gives it a stronger faculty orientation and makes its perspective inevitably somewhat divergent from that of the AAHE (which represents administrators as well as faculty members) and from that of the community of organizationally tied (administratively oriented) associations. Thus, although it has its office in the ACE building and participates in much interaction among ACE constituent organizations, the AAUP has not joined these associations in the active endorsement of broad institutional support. In the words of the Self-Survey Committee of the AAUP (American Association of University Professors, 1965):

> The AAUP, like the Congress itself, has been troubled with the church and state issue in relation to general programs of federal aid to education. The Annual Meetings of the Association and the sessions of the Council have tended to favor increased federal financial aid to higher education, but have sometimes been sharply divided concerning the desirability of extending such aid to church-affiliated institutions. The possible role of the Association in this policy area has been greatly weakened by its inability to resolve its own internal differences in this regard /p. 178/.

There are strong pressures, nevertheless, for the "presidents' clubs" to work with the AAUP in those areas of federal relations in which their commitments do coincide (as in the opposition to disclaimer affidavits) and in such broad areas of mutual interest as the improvement of college teaching. The AAUP is a highly influential organization among college faculties and is one of the only comprehensive faculty organizations through which such cooperation can take place on the national level. Thus, while ACE leadership made the deliberate decision in 1962 not to spread the efforts of the Council too thin by trying to represent the whole range of higher education on the national level, it has looked to the AAUP to provide its one direct link nationally with higher education faculty. A working rapport with the AAUP is of critical importance to the ACE and its Group A constituent members.

The National Commission on Accrediting (NCA)

The National Commission on Accrediting, like the NACUBO Committee on Governmental Relations, serves in a primarily consultative capacity in relation to the

ACE. As special task organizations, these associations tend to be called in to provide information and advice when legislative problems arise in the areas of their special expertise.

The Council of Graduate Schools (CGS)

The Council of Graduate Schools is not yet a central member of the higher education community--partially, perhaps, because it is relatively new to the Washington scene, and partially because it is not a presidents' club (most institutional representatives to this association are graduate deans) with broad concern for the administration of the whole university. It is included in this grouping primarily because of the membership of its president in the Higher Education Secretariat, to be described below.

PATTERNED INTERACTION AMONG MEMBERS OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION COMMUNITY

One source of continuity among the missions of the ACE and those of the organizationally tied associations described above is the very great overlap in institutional membership among these organizations. Not only does overlapping membership militate against the possibility of widely divergent policies and programs, but it can be used as well by association leadership as a basis for avoiding interorganizational conflict over specific issues. One association executive reported that

> when members of this association press for a legislative stand different from that of ACE's, we tell them "If you don't agree with ACE, register a complaint directly to them. You're members of ACE directly, not just through us."

More important in bringing about consensus among higher education associations in their relations with government, however, has been the extensive interaction among executive officers which their heightened involvement with government in recent years has stimulated. While much of this interaction occurs on an *ad hoc* basis, a number of structures have been created to facilitate communication among executive secretaries and directors on a regular basis. A majority of these structures are informal insofar as they are not themselves legal entities (with constitutions, bylaws, and so on), are not parts of formal organizations, do not involve any formal machinery for decision making, and have no authority over their participants or other groups.

The Higher Education Secretariat

Since the reorganization of the ACE in 1962, a group of 12 executive secretaries has begun to meet once a month with Logan Wilson, President of the ACE. This group came into existence at the instigation of the associations themselves, rather than of President Wilson or the ACE, and has come to be called the Higher Education Secretariat. Representing all of the associations described above except the NACUBO Committee on Governmental Relations (see Appendix D for a list of organizational participants in the Secretariat), these executive secretaries discuss any topics of common concern to them, but one of their major topics has been federal legislation and association strategy in shaping it.

Through these monthly sessions the top personnel of higher education associations are able to keep each other informed as to the policies and activities of their respective organizations. They are able to share information about, and interpretations of, legislative issues and to explore the possibility of association consensus on them. Where consensus can be reached, and a program of action agreed upon, a division of labor among the participants may result, with information-gathering functions and responsibility for contacting government personnel parceled out to the most appropriate organizational representatives. An occasional feature of these meetings is the arrangement of joint Congressional testimony in relation to issues on which association views coincide or can be reconciled.

Only chief executive officers attend the meetings of the Secretariat; when regular participants are unable to be there, no substitute association representatives attend in their place.

Meetings with the Director of ACE's Commission on Federal Relations (The Morse Group)

A core group of executive officers and governmental relations personnel comes together from time to time at the invitation of John Morse, Director of ACE's Commission on Federal Relations, to discuss legislative questions. Included in this narrower grouping are representatives of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, the Association of American Colleges, the American Association of Junior Colleges, the American Association for Higher Education, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and the National Catholic Educational Association. Depending on the issues, representatives of other organizations, such as the NACUBO Committee on Governmental Relations and the National Commission on Accrediting may be asked to attend as well.

Commission on Federal Relations Meetings

Association representatives are invited to attend, in a consultative capacity, the meetings of the ACE's Commission on Federal Relations. (See Appendix D for a list of organizations which send representatives to Commission meetings.) Assembling several times a year, the Commission holds an open session during the morning, when the executive officers of constituent organization members are invited to "comment, urge and suggest" with regard to Commission policies and activities.

Following this session, the Commission members (most of them executives of ACE member institutions) meet in closed executive session where Commission policy is determined. Aside from the ad hoc meetings of association personnel with John Morse, it is primarily at these open sessions that organizational representatives have an opportunity to exert influence on the operations of the Commission on Federal Relations.

The Governmental Relations Luncheon Group

The Governmental Relations Luncheon Group, often referred to more simply as the Tuesday Luncheon Club, meets every other week at the Brookings Institution to discuss a wide range of topics relating to federal and association activity. Initiated as a small, intimate luncheon gathering during the Korean War, it is now attended by representatives of roughly 25 higher education associations as well as by members of non-higher education groups and, frequently, by representatives from the U. S. Office of Education. Attendance at these sessions is highly variable, and many participants feel that the meetings have declined in usefulness as they have grown in size. While they still afford an opportunity to exchange information of a general nature, they are no longer seen as a context for the consideration of controversial issues or for important decision making.

Although executive secretaries do attend these luncheon meetings, many associations are represented there by lower echelon staff members.

Monthly Meetings with the U.S. Office of Education

A group composed primarily of the Higher Education Secretariat meets once a month with the Associate Commissioner for Higher Education, to be briefed on the activities of the Office of Education and to keep the Office informed of the association response to federal programs. Through this monthly meeting, as well as through other ad hoc meetings between association executive officers and the Office of Education, a rapport has been established which has, in fact, been disturbing to members of Congress. During hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Education in 1966 (United States Senate, 1966), Senator Ralph Yarborough (Texas) of that Subcommittee reacted to the testimony of an ACE representative reprovingly.

> Over the past several years, before the war in Vietnam was escalated to the present position, I have been dismayed a number of times at educational groups coming in and testifying to a position that, I was very much surprised when they were asked about it later, they said, "the Office of Education wants this." I don't think that the testimony of the educational communities of America is going to be worth much to us if the educational community phones the administration and says, "What do you want?" and then comes up and testifies for it /pp. 252-253/.

According to a Congressional staff member, the feeling that the ACE has been overly responsive to Administration requests is shared by advocates of educational legislation in the House of Representatives as well.

COMMUNITY NORMS

When interorganizational relations occur in a coalitional context, according to Warren's scheme (1967), "there are no norms of commitment to an inclusive leadership, but there are general norms that govern the interaction of the unit leaders involved /p. 405/." In the case of organizationally tied associations in Washington, the primary commitment of association leaders is to their memberships, which retain final authority over association policy. There are norms, however, which govern the interaction among executive officers in Washington, and which are generally consistent with the accountability of these officers to the memberships they represent.

There is, for example, a tacit agreement of long standing among the Higher Education Secretariat that no association will actively protest legislation benefitting the institutional members of other associations. Honoring this agreement, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges has never actively opposed scholarship legislation, although it has long disapproved of federal scholarships (Babbidge and Rosenzweig, 1962). When, on the other hand, the AAJC Office of Governmental Relations stated publicly (in its Federal Affairs Bulletin) its objection to a bill drafted and strongly supported by the AASCU and the NASULGC, immediate disapproval was expressed by more than one executive officer to the AAJC officers responsible. In such instances, few powerful sanctions can be brought to bear against an offending organization or officer, but community censure is expressed--and conformity to the norm urged--in each of the various contexts in which executive officers interact.

Closely related to this basic community norm is a tendency to censure organizations who campaign too actively and independently in pursuit of special benefits for their own members. Several instances in which the AAJC was thought to have acted inapproriately in recent years, by urging special consideration of the junior college in Congress, led during 1966 to two forms of reprisal. First, their behavior was discussed and strongly criticized at meetings of the Secretariat with Logan Wilson--with the result, at least, that the AAJC was clearly informed of community sentiment against its activities. But second, and more important as a possible inducement to change in the AAJC approach to Congress, was a warning it received from Senator Morse. Reacting to an AAJC proposal for separate legislation to support junior colleges, Morse stated (United States Senate, 1966):

> Yesterday we heard Dr. Priest who is the president of the American Association of

> Junior and Community Colleges. . .His testimony, as you will note when you read it, called for more money and it also advocated consideration for a separate act, a separate law for community and junior colleges support. . .I am not convinced that that is a desirable legislative approach. In [my colloquy yesterday] I said one of my first fears was that it might weaken the unity that has existed among the educational institutions of the country to go back to the old program which, I think, blocked Federal aid to education for years and years in this country, when each segment of education sought to get legislation that would meet its specific needs but not legislation giving unified support to meet the needs of other education institutions. . .I am a little worried about drawing a line of separation between the so-called higher education institutions, standard 4-year variety, and the higher education institutions of the junior and community college variety [pp. 268-269].

Thus, the same governmental pressures which stimulated the development of cooperative patterns among organizationally tied associations in the early 1960's continue to reinforce these patterns when deviance from them threatens to become too great. Such reactions from members of Congress are greeted by members of the Secretariat as an important reaffirmation that in unity lies the maximum benefit for all types of higher education institutions.

More generally, it is expected of members of the Higher Education Secretariat that they will confer with each other, insofar as possible, before taking any major action related to educational legislation.

While it is fully accepted that the policy interests of the various associations do not completely coincide, there are pressures on association leadership to keep each other informed of all important association activity in relation to government.

General conformity to these norms--along with a consistent effort on the part of many of these organizationally tied associations to emphasize areas of legislative agreement among themselves and to deemphasize issues on which they disagree--was instrumental in both 1963 and 1965 in bringing about the passage of major higher education legislation. The key to the political success of these organizations, as Pettit (1965) has emphasized, has been the establishment of a set of priorities which provide federal assistance for all types of institutions, on terms which both public and private colleges could accept and support, and the putting aside, if only temporarily, of issues on which consensus among these various associations could not be achieved.

THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACTS OF 1963 AND 1965

The passage of the Higher Education Facilities Act in 1963 marked the culmination of efforts first inititated in Congress in 1960 to provide higher education institutions with federal grants as well as loans for the construction of academic facilities. While federal loans had been available to academic institutions since 1950 (through the College Housing Loan Program) for the construction of revenue-producing facilities, population projections indicating the likelihood that college and university enrollment would double within a ten-year period had begun to make clear the need for federal aid in the construction of non-revenue-producing classroom facilities as well. The question was whether assistance for non-revenue-producing facilities should take the form of loans (for which repayment would have to be made through increased tuition) or federal grants, or both (Babbidge and Rosenzweig, 1962). Although an education bill providing matching grants for the construction of academic facilities, in addition to loan funds through a continuation of the College Housing Loan Program, was first considered in Congress in 1960, it was not until 1961 that the organizations described above were able to voice unanimity in their support of federal grants for classroom construction, and it was not until 1963 that their support successfully aided the passage of legislation providing grants as well as loans to assist the development of academic institutions.

The basic issue which divided the higher education community in 1960 was the church-state question. The government had been making funds available to sectarian as well as nonsectarian colleges and universities for many years, of course, in the form of categorical aid and in the name of national defense. But because of the clear role of the government as a purchaser of higher education products in this form of support, the inclusion of church-related institutions in such federal programs had never before raised the constitutional question of the separation of church and state. Categorical support was not considered to be of direct assistance to religious educational institutions as such; nor were the loans made available to both sectarian and non sectarian institutions through the College Housing Loan Program of 1950 considered a possible violation of the First Amendment, since loans, it was argued, do not really constitute aid to education. The possibility of direct grants to assist the development of higher education institutions as such, however, raised the question for many educators as well as Congressmen of the constitutionality of federal aid to church-affiliated colleges. Although a 1960 poll of the ACE membership indicated that 90 percent of the responding institutional members were in favor of federal grants as well as loans for classroom facilities (Babbidge and Rosenzweig, 1962), disputes among the members of the ACE and the AAC regarding the constitutionality of including sectarian institutions in such a program prevented these organizations from actively supporting grant proposals. Only the NASULGC and the AAJC (whose public community college members had not been eligible to participate in the College Housing Loan Program) were immediately in favor of a program of institutional grants (Pettit, 1965).

Under direct pressure from concerned legislators for some clear and unified higher education stand on the matter, other associations were able to concur by 1961 in the endorsement of grants as well as loans for academic facilities. During Congressional hearings in 1961, a spokesman for the ACE, the AAHE, and AAC testified in favor of a combination of grants and loans (Pettit, 1965). The NASULGC had played an important part in encouraging this change.

Although both the House of Representatives and the Senate passed bills providing federal aid to higher education in 1962, the two houses were unable to reconcile important differences in these bills, and no higher education legislation was passed that year. The Senate version provided loans for academic facilities and provisions for federal scholarships, while the House version included both loans and grants for the construction of facilities and no scholarship provisions. The Senate would not accept the grant provisions in the House bill (as a result of keen Southern concern over the church-state issue) and the House remained opposed (on more general ideological grounds) to the provision of scholarships (Price, 1964).

Although the ACE, the AAC, and other organizations, such as the AAHE,had been advocates of a scholarship program for several years (and had strongly supported student aid provisions in the National Defense Education Act of 1958), they indicated their willingness in 1962 to put aside the controversial issue of scholarships in order to focus their efforts on the issue on which organizationally tied associations were by then in agreement: the importance of grants as well as loans for academic facilities. After the two different bills had passed in the House of Representatives and the Senate, a statement was issued jointly by the ACE, the AAC, the AAJC, the NASULGC and the AASCU, indicating their unanimous support for a combination of grants and loans and making no mention of the scholarship question which had embroiled the Senate bill in controversy within the House (Pettit, 1965).

This decision on the part of the ACE, particularly, to give scholarships a low priority in its legislative recommendations was an important one in bringing about association unity in 1963 and the passage of the Higher Education Facilities Act. Neither the NASULGC nor the AASCU would have supported scholarship provisions; and though they stood to gain much more for their member institutions from federal grants for the construction of facilities than from federal loans (many of these public institutions, like the public junior colleges, are prohibited by state constitution or statute from accepting federal loans /Price, 1964/), they actively supported loans as well as grants in deference to the church-state issue and the possibility that many sectarian institutions might be excluded from a federal grant program.

Finally, an important conflict within the higher education community lay in the AAC's advocacy of tax credit legislation--to which, by this time, all of the other major higher education associations were quietly or vociferously opposed. By agreeing to put this issue aside in 1963 (although, as described above, it was to be reaffirmed as an AAC concern in 1964), the AAC paid final tribute to the new unity of the higher education community in its legislative recommendations.

Other factors, of course, played an important part in bringing about the passage of the 1963 Higher Education Facilities Act. The assassination of President Kennedy clearly had an impact on Congressional behavior in 1963; and, in addition, a number of Congressmen in both houses had become convinced of the need for grants for classroom construction and actively sought association support in their own efforts to get such legislation passed. It is doubtful, however, whether such legislation could have passed without the unified support of the higher education community.

And despite the reiteration by the AAC at its 1964 annual meeting of its support for tax credit provisions for the parents of college students, the unity of the presidents' clubs in their views toward federal aid persisted into the hearings for the Higher Education Act of 1965. Here it was most strikingly the efforts of the NASULGC to avoid intergroup conflict which resulted in the unprecedented passage of scholarships for undergraduate students.

In its statement, entitled _Commitment to expanding opportunity: Proposals for federal action in education_ (American Council on Education, 1965), the ACE placed greatest emphasis on continued federal assistance for the expansion of academic facilities. In strong second place, however, was its endorsement of "new and expanded Federal programs of financial assistance to students [p. 6]." Among the specific proposals of the Council was that

> . . .a program of direct assistance should be established for needy and able students, with the amount of the award related to the income of the student and his parents. These awards might be called "opportunity grants," for they would give the student an opportunity to obtain a higher education which he might otherwise not have if he had to depend on loans and student employment alone [p. 8].

In a similar statement prepared by the NASULGC at its 1964 convention, Recommendations on desirable national action affecting higher education (National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 1965), the NASULGC expressed its continued opposition to scholarship aid:

> While strongly supporting the expansion of private and other non-Federal scholarship aids, our association has for a number of years consistently opposed a general Federal scholarship program for undergraduates, and continues to do so. Opposition to a

> Federal program has been based on two principal factors: (1) Continuing lack of evidence that any national scholarship program will have any marked effect in assuring college attendance of an appreciable number of students who cannot now enroll under existing programs; and (2) the fact that higher education has higher priority needs requiring Federal financial assistance [p. 620].

By 1965, however, a university president representing the Association before the House Subcommittee on Education (U. S. House of Representatives, 1965) was able to testify that, despite the NASULGC's previous opposition to scholarship aid for undergraduates, it was willing to support the scholarship provision of the 1965 Higher Education Act:

> . . .But we would like to call to your attention that it is not really a scholarship bill in the normal sense for the ablest student academically. It is really a group of opportunity grants because it is keyed very closely to income levels rather than to academic standings. It is in that connection that we want to give it particular support because most of our students are from low- or middle-income families [p. 629].

Through its emphasis on aid for needy students, rather than for the most talented ones, the ACE once again had found a formula for creating consensus among its constituent organization members, all of whom were able to support the Council's major proposals for federal action. As a result, nearly all of these proposals were subsequently enacted into law.

This is not to suggest that conflicts of interest do not remain--some more evident than others--among the higher education associations described here. Few observers would suggest that the church-state controversy--which has threatened to divide public and private institutions on the national level--has been in any sense resolved. Cooperation between public and church-related colleges has been possible, rather, because the church-state issue has not been seriously raised. That is, the constitutionality of federal aid to church-related schools has not yet been tested. Should the issue be raised at some future time, with the result that sectarian schools are excluded from the benefits of legislation assisting nonsectarian ones, major differences in legislative interest will sharply divide these two types of institution.

Even at the present time the tax credit issue, in some sense, divides them; a number of private colleges belonging to the AAC are the institutions which have maintained their support of the tax credit idea, while the public universities and colleges which make up the memberships of the NASULGC and the AASCU have most strongly opposed it. While the issue has not come to a head through serious Congressional consideration of a tax credit law, the Executive Director of the NASULGC (Thackrey) remarked in 1966:

> I do not underestimate the support of the tax credit proposal, and I think that were it not for the Vietnam situation, it probably would have a very good chance of passage in the current Congress. One reason for that is that there has never been an opportunity for hearings on it in order that the opponents as well as the proponents would have a chance to state their case /pp. 160-161/.

Should hearings be held on this issue in the near future, they would undoubtedly engender open conflict within the higher education community.

Another continuing scource of strain on interorganizational cohesion among these associations is the often independent behavior of the American Association of

Junior Colleges. While mutual disapproval of the AAJC's aggressive and unilateral approach to Congress is, in fact, one of the indices of shared community values and norms and works in some sense to reinforce group commitment to these norms (through prolonged discussion among groups of organizational representatives and, particularly, through the expressed disapproval of AAJC behavior on the part of such important Congressional allies as Senator Morse), there is, nevertheless, apprehension on the part of association personnel that the notable success of the AAJC, in a number of instances, in obtaining what they define to be special consideration from Congress, will tempt or compel other organizations to wage similarly independent campaigns on behalf of special member interests.

Finally, there is widespread concern among Washington-based associations regarding the present influx of new educational organizations into the Washington area. While the representation of many types of higher education interests on the national level provides an important opportunity for new forms of interaction and coordinative effort, it threatens, at the same time, the precarious patterns of coalition through which a small number of higher education organizations have successfully related to government in recent years. As new associations establish Washington offices, organizations with longer tenure in the Capital have an important stake in seeing that politically naive association representatives do not rush off to Federal agencies or to Capitol Hill to express uninformed views on higher education legislation. Yet inclusion of new representatives in the regular meetings of more experienced association executive officers makes these meeting groups too large and unwieldy for the performance of important coordinative functions. Having achieved its major successes in the last decade through strategies devised in small, informal meetings among the representatives of a few key organizations, the Higher Education Secretariat must now begin to expand its ranks (and formalize its patterns of cooperation) or fail to gain significant influence over the governmental relations of the many higher education associations which are establishing new offices in the Capital every year.

CONCLUSION

Institutionally tied associations--more than other types of higher education associations in the United States--have responded to federal involvement in the higher education enterprise by seeking to participate in the federal policy process, in the words of Eldersveld (1958), not "periodically and intermittently, but continuously and for the purpose of developing and sustaining contact and influence /p. 192/" with the federal administrators and Congressmen who shape higher education policy. In the process, they have developed an effective pattern of intergroup relations which, Eldersveld suggests, is typical of many interest groups in the United States today. This pattern is, in an important sense, a response to pressures from the government itself to reduce the number of separate and conflicting demands made upon the legislative process by the multiplicity of organized interests within each institutional sphere. Congressional urging in the early 1960's for some organization or group to "speak for higher education" was a clear indication of the need for many differences of interest within a sphere such as higher education to be resolved independently of the governmental decision-making processes.

But interorganizational cooperation among interest groups not only simplifies the task of legislators, it allows crucial legislative priorities to be established outside of the governmental context by those whom legislation will most directly affect. Thus, the development of an effective strategy of intergroup relations among higher education associations in Washington has meant the creation of a national context for inclusive decision making regarding higher education priorities--a context which, before 1960, simply did not exist. Had higher education associations been unwilling or unable to provide leadership and an inclusive context for the determination of legislative priorities, the task would have fallen almost entirely to the federal government. Cooperative efforts among these organizations have thus functioned importantly to preserve the autonomy of the higher education system in its deepening relationship with the federal government.

This study of the changing role of academic voluntary associations in the national higher education system has tended to account for changes in association behavior as products of external or environmental forces rather than of internal organizational processes. In general, the politicization of higher education associations has been viewed as a response to pressures upon these organizations from their changing national environment, and most particularly as a response to the profound involvement of the federal government in higher education affairs. The development of coalitional relations among institutionally tied associations was attributed chiefly to encouragement from the government that these organizations seek consensus among themselves on their educational policy desires before articulating these desires to government. Finally, significant modifications in association goals and behavior were attributed, in the discussion of the higher education community in Washington, to the growing influence upon each of the relevant institutionally tied associations of the activity of other like associations with which it regularly interacts in Washington.

This approach to the study of higher education organizations deviates from the traditional concentration of organizational theorists on intraorganizational processes and on internally induced organizational change. There are, it would seem, two important bases for this deviation. The first is the argument on theoretical grounds of the appropriateness and usefulness of turning attention to the place of organizations in the larger social system of which they are components or subsystems. "Perhaps in the normal developmental course of a science," as Terreberry (1968) suggests, "intrasystem analysis necessarily precedes the intersystem focus /p. 594/." The trend toward greater interest in interorganizational processes is, in this sense, a natural outgrowth of the earlier theoretical concern with processes internal to organization.

The second basis for this shift in focus, however, is empirical evidence suggesting the increasing interrelatedness or interdependency of formal organizations in modern technological society, and the enhanced influence on organizational behavior of environmental conditions. As Terreberry points out, a wide range of current literature on formal organizations supports the hypotheses

> . . .(1) that contemporary changes in organizational environments are such as to increase the ratic of externally induced [organizational] change to internally induced change; and (2) that other formal organizations are, increasingly, the important components in the environment of any focal organization [pp. 591-592].

Illustrating this trend in the higher education sphere, we have tried to describe the general process through which segments of the federal government, and other academic associations, have become increasingly important components in the environment of many higher education associations in Washington. And we have suggested that the new interconnections developing among these organizations are a source of system integration within higher education on the national level, while preserving the autonomy of the higher education enterprise from the independent (and necessarily somewhat different) purposes of the national government.

Within this interorganizational framework, two theoretical perspectives have guided the foregoing analysis: First, the literature on interest group behavior directed our attention to the conditions under which voluntary associations in any institutional sphere tend to assume the important role as linkages with the federal government and to articulate the policy demands of their members to federal agencies and Congress. Interest group theory also drew attention to the general connection between a rapid proliferation of interest groups (such as is occurring in a number of institutional spheres in the United States today) and the pressure toward increased bargaining and alliance among organizations representing closely related interests to a federal government.

Second, a particularly valuable conceptual framework for the analysis of interorganizational relations among one group of higher education associations in Washington was Warren's (1967) typology of contexts for inclusive decision making. This scheme would seem to provide an important point of departure for future research into developing patterns of interorganizational influence within higher education on the national level. If (as suggested in this chapter) a coalitional context for interorganizational decision making can function effectively for a limited number of organizations sharing certain mutual (or mutually definable) goals, under conditions of environmental (in this case, governmental) pressure toward intergroup cooperation, it would be especially fruitful to explore further 1) the conditions under which such a coalitional context can continue to be effective for inclusive decision making; 2) the effect on such a context of the continued proliferation of potential organizational participants in the inclusive decision making process; and 3) the possible alternatives to coalitional relations under conditions in which informal patterns of intergroup cooperation are difficult to sustain.

Emery and Trist (1965) have stressed the importance of attention to the "causal texture" of the environment of formal organizations. "A main problem in the study of organizational change," they write, "is that the environmental contexts in which organizations exist are themselves changing, at an increasing rate, and towards increasing complexity /p. 21/." They suggest a typology of organizational environments which depicts an evolution (in modern, technological society) from a "placid, clustered" organizational field to an increasingly "turbulent" field, with important implications for the quality, range, and intensity of organizational interdependencies. Their typology of environmental conditions for interorganizational behavior provides an extremely valuable guide for the future study of the role of national organizations in higher education.

Finally, it was a basic purpose of this exploratory investigation to suggest the broad range of higher education interests represented by academic associations nationally, and to describe and analyze the common tendency among these associations to establish closer ties with the federal government. This study also emphasizes critical variation, however, in the basic purposes of several different types of academic associations in Washington, indicating how differences in organizational focus have combined with historical factors to bring about varied patterns of relationship to the government and among associations of each type. Further investigation of the role of academic associations as components of the national higher education system might begin most productively with a narrower focus on changing behavior patterns among organizations of a single type. This narrower focus would not only allow a more intensive analysis of the distinctive contribution of each association type to the development of an ordered national system, but it would also become increasingly important, we would suggest, because of the likelihood that the primary interests and goals of these different types will further diverge in future years.

It is quite possible, for example, that the process of professionalization, described as a major development among discipline-oriented associations, will lead to increasingly conflictual relations between these organizations and the administration-oriented associations which represent institutions on the national level (with serious implications, it should be added, for the already-strained relationships between administrators and faculty members on the university campus). The professionalization of disciplinary associations represents a strong thrust toward the more precise delineation and strengthening of disciplinary boundaries, with a corresponding stress on the promotion of work autonomy for disciplinary groups--on the achievement of greater independence from university, as well as extra-university, forms of control over faculty activity. In this respect, the increasing instrumentalism and politicization of discipline-oriented associations threatens to bring them into direct conflict with institutionally tied associations, whose fundamental objectives include the maintenance of cohesive, reasonably integrated institutions of higher education (a condition requiring the preservation of a degree of administrative authority over diverse disciplinary groups within the university structure).

Emerging patterns of relationship among discipline-oriented associations--and between these learned societies and other organizations such as institutionally tied associations and segments of the federal government--provide an especially rich field for continued research into the national organization of American higher education.

Appendixes

APPENDIX A

LIST OF HIGHER EDUCATION ASSOCIATIONS BY TYPE

Institutionally Tied Associations

*American Association for Higher Education (NEA)
American Association of College and University Business Officers
*American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy
American Association of Colleges of Podiatry
*American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (NEA)
*American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers
American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business
American Association of Dental Schools
*American Association of Junior Colleges
American Association of Osteopathic Colleges
American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism
*American Association of State Colleges and Universities
American Association of Theological Schools
American College Health Association
*American College Personnel Association
*American College Public Relations Association
American Conference of Academic Deans

---

*Central or branch office in Washington, D. C.

*American Council on Education
American Council on Schools and Colleges
American Schools of Oriental Research
American Society of Journalism School Administrators
American Universities Field Staff
*Association of American Colleges
*Association of American Law Schools
*Association of American Library Schools
*Association of American Medical Colleges
*Association of American Universities
Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges
Association of College Admissions Counselors
Association of College Research Libraries
Association of College Unions
Association of College and University Housing Officers
*Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture
Association for the Coordination of University Religious Affairs
Association of Departments of English
Association of Episcopal Colleges
*Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges
Association of Graduate Schools in Association of American Universities
Association of Hospital Directors of Medical Education
Association of Military Colleges and Schools
Association of Naval ROTC Colleges
*Association of Research Libraries
Association for School, College and University Staff
Association of Schools and Colleges of Optometry
Association of Schools of Public Health
Association of University Evening Colleges
Association of University Programs in Hospital Administration
Association of University Summer Sessions
Association of Urban Universities
College Student Personnel Institute
*College and University Personnel Association
Conference on Jesuit Student Personnel Administrators
*Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges
Council of Catholic Schools of Nursing
Council on Cooperative College Projects
*Council of Graduate Schools in the United States

*Council of Protestant Colleges and Universities
Council of Mennonite Colleges
Council of Student Personnel Associations
Council of University Teaching Hospitals
*Engineering College Administrative Council
Engineering College Research Council
Evening Student Personnel Association
Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants
Jesuit Educational Association
National Association of College Deans and Registrars
National Association of College and University Summer Sessions
National Association of Colleges of Teachers of Agriculture
National Association of Music Executives in State Universities
National Association of Schools of Art
*National Association of Schools of Music
*National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges
National Association of Student Personnel Administrators
*National Association of Women's Deans and Counselors
*National Lutheran Educational Conference
National University Extension Association
Orientation Directors Conference
Union for Research and Experimentation in Higher Education
*United Business School Association
University Council for Educational Administration

Discipline-Oriented Associations

Academy of Applied Science
Academy of Management
Academy of Political Science
Academy of Teachers of Occupations
American Academy of Advertising
American Academy of Arts and Sciences
American Academy of the History of Dentistry
American Academy of Political and Social Science
*American Anthropological Association
*American Association for the Advancement of Science

American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies
American Association of Anatomists
American Association of Architectural Bibliographers
American Association of Bioanalysts
American Association for the Comparative Study of Law
American Association of Evangelical Students
American Association of Housing Educators
*American Association of Immunologists
American Association for Middle Eastern Studies
American Association of Physical Anthropologists
*American Association of Physics Teachers
*American Association for Social Psychiatry
American Association of Teacher Education in Agriculture
American Association of Teachers of French
American Association of Teachers of German
American Association of Teachers of Italian
American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages
American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese
American Astronomical Society
*American Catholic Historical Association
*American Catholic Philosophical Association
American Catholic Psychological Association
American Catholic Sociological Society
American Ceramic Society
*American Chemical Society
American Classical League
American Comparative Literature Association
American Council on Education for Journalism
American Council of Learned Societies
American Council on Pharmaceutical Education
American Economic Association
*American Educational Research Association
American Entomological Society
American Epidemiological Society
*American Ethnological Society
American Eugenics Society
American Federation of Information Processing Societies
American Folklore Society
*American Genetic Society
American Geographical Society

*American Geological Institute
*American Geophysical Union
*American Historical Association
*American Home Economics Association
American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics
*American Institute of Biological Sciences
American Institute of the History of Pharmacy
American Institute of Indian Studies
American Institute of Industrial Arts Teacher Education
American Institute of Musicology
*American Institute of Physics
American Law Institute
American Law Student Association
American Mathematical Society
American Microchemical Society
American Name Society
American Ornithological Union
American Philological Association
American Philosophical Association
American Philosophical Society
American Physical Society
*American Physiological Society
American Phytophalological Society
*American Political Science Association
*American Psychiatric Association
*American Psychological Association
*American Psychopathological Association
American Risk and Insurance Association
American Society of Adlerian Psychology
*American Society of Biological Chemists
American Society of Christian Ethics
*American Society for Engineering Education
American Society of Ethnohistory
American Society of Human Genetics
*American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists
*American Society of Landscape Architects
American Society for Legal History
American Society of Mammalogists
American Society of Mechanical Engineers
American Society of Microbiology
American Society of Naturalists
American Society of Papyrologists
American Society of Parasitologists

*American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therepeutics
American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy
American Society of Professional Biologists
*American Society for Public Administration
American Society for the Study of Religion
American Society for Theatre Research
American Society of University Composers
American Society of Zoologists
*American Sociological Association
American Sociometric Association
*American Statistical Association
American Studies Association
American Theological Society
American Vacuum Society
Animal Behavior Society
Archaeological Institute of America
*Associated Organizations for Teacher Education
Associated University Bureaus of Business and Economic Research, Bureau of Business and Economic Research
*Association of American Geographers
Association of American Rhodes Scholars
Association for Comparative Economics
*Association for Counselor Education and Supervision
Association for Education in International Business
Association for Education in Journalism
Association for the Education of Teachers in Science
Association for Evolutionary Economics
Association of Existential Psychology and Psychiatry
Association for General and Liberal Studies
Association of Marshal Scholars and Alumni
*Association for Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance
*Association for Professional Broadcasting Education
Association of Professors of Medicine
Association for Research in Growth Relationships
Association for Research in Ophthalmology
Association of Social Science Teachers
*Association of Student Chapters, American Institute of Architects
*Association of Student International Law Societies/American Society of International Law
Association for Student Teaching
Association for the Study of Soviet-Type Economics

Association for Symbolic Logic
Association of Teachers of Japanese
Association of Teachers of Preventive Medicine
Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy
Association of University Anesthetists
Association of University Radiologists
Biophysical Society
*Business Education Research Foundation
C.G. Jung Foundation for Analytical Psychology
*Catholic Anthropological Association
Catholic Economic Association
Ceramic Educational Council
College Art Association of America
College Language Association
College Music Society
Collegiate Council for the United Nations
Committee for the Development of Art in Negro Colleges
Comparative Education Society
*Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences
Conference on British Studies
Conference on College Composition and Communication
*Conference on Latin American History/Hispanic Foundation
Cooper Ornithological Society
Council for Distributive Teacher Education
Council on Education in Professional Responsibility
Council on Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Education
Council on Optometric Education
Council for Philosophical Studies
Council for Professional Education for Business
Council of Social Work Education
Ecological Society of America
Econometric Society
Economic History Association
Electrochemical Society
Endocrine Society
Engineers Council for Professional Development
English Institute
*Entomological Society of America
Far-Eastern Prehistory Association
*Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology
Fellows in American Studies
Genetics Society of America

*Geochemical Society
Geological Society of America
Great Plains Historical Association
Hispanic Society of America
History of Education Society
History of Science Society
Institute for Intercultural Studies
Institute of International Education
Institute of Mathematical Statistics
Inter University Consortium for Political Research
Intercollegiate Society of Individualists
International Association for Philosophy of Law and Social Philosophy--American Sector
International Studies Association
Jesuit Seismological Association
Jewish Academy of Arts and Sciences
John Dewey Society
Joint Committee on Continuing Legal Education
Joint Council on Economic Education
Journalism Association of Junior Colleges
Kroeber Anthropological Society
Law Student Civil Rights Research Council
Linguistics Society of America
Mathematics Association of America
Mediaeval Academy of America
Metaphysical Society of America
*Modern Humanities Research Association
Modern Language Association of America
Mongolian Society
Mycological Society of America
National Academy of Education
*National Academy of Engineering
*National Academy of Sciences--National Research Council
*National Association for Business Teacher Education
*National Association of College Wind and Percussion Instructors
National Association of Dramatic and Speech Arts
*National Association of Educational Broadcasters
National Association of Geology Teachers
National Association of Industrial Teacher Education
National Association for Physical Education of College Women
National Association for Practical Nurse Education and

Service
National Association for Research in Science Teaching
National Center for Education in Politics
National College Physical Education Association for Men
National Collegiate Association for Secretaries
National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration
National Conference on Research on English
National Council for Geographic Studies
National Council on Measurement in Education
National Federation of Modern Language Teachers' Associations
National Institute for Architectural Education
*National Institute of Social and Behavioral Sciences
National Institute of Social Science
National Organization on Legal Problems of Education
National Society of College Teachers of Education
National Society for the Study of Communications
National Society for the Study of Education
National Student Nurses' Association
Nuttall Ornithological Club
Operations Research Society of America
Organization of American Historians
Parapsychological Association
Philosophy of Education Society
Philosophy of Science Association
Phycological Society of America
Psychometric Society
Psychonomic Society
Radiation Research Society
Rural Sociological Society
School and College Conference on English
Scientific Research Society of America
Seismological Society of America
Society for the Advancement of Education
Society for American Anthropology
Society of American Archivists
*Society of American Foresters
Society of American Historians
Society for American Philosophy
Society for Ancient Greek Philosophy
Society for Applied Anthropology

Society of Architectural Historians
Society for Developmental Biology
Society for Ethnomusicology
Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine
Society for French Historical Studies
Society of General Physiologists
Society for General Systems Research
Society for the History of Discoveries
Society for the History of Technology
Society for Italian Historical Studies
Society of Multivariate Experimental Psychology
Society for Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy
Society for Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment
Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues
Society for Psychophysiological Research
Society for the Scientific Study of Sex
Society for the Study of Evolution
Society of University Surgeons
*Society of Women Geographers
Sociological Research Association
Solar Energy Society
Southern Historical Association
Speech Association of America
Standards Engineers Society
Student American Medical Association
*Student National Education Association
*Student Personnel Association for Teacher Education
Tissue Culture Association
*United States Committee for Byzantine Studies
University Aviation Association
Urban History Group
Wilson Ornithological Society

Faculty-Oriented Associations

*American Association of University Professors
*American Federation of Teachers

Special Task Associations

Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges
African Scholarship Program of American Universities
*American Alumni Council
*American Association of Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care
*American Association of University Women
*American College Testing Program
Associated Collegiate Presses
*Associated Universities, Inc.
Association of American University Presses
Board of Schools of Medical Technology
College Band Directors National Association
*College Entrance Examination Board
College Retirement Equity Fund
Cooperative College Registry
Council for Financial Aid to Education
Council of Social Science Data Archives
Council on College Level Examinations
Council on College Magazines Associated
Council on Evaluation of Foreign Student Credentials
Educational Council for Foreign Medical Graduates
Engineering College Magazines Associated
Independent College Funds of America
*Jesuit Research Council of America
National Alumni Association
National Association for Foreign Student Affairs
National Association of Catholic Alumni Clubs
*National Association of College and University Business Officers
*National Commission on Accrediting
*National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards
*National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
National Council of College Publications Advisers
National Fund for Graduate Nursing Education
National Scholarship Service Fund for Negro Students
Negro College Committee on Adult Education
*Scientific Manpower Commission
*Social Science Research Council
Teacher Insurance and Annuity Association
*United Negro College Fund

*United States Student Press Association
University Film Foundation
University Film Producers' Association
*University Research Association

APPENDIX B

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF HIGHER EDUCATION ASSOCIATIONS WITH OFFICES IN WASHINGTON, D.C., BY TYPE OF ASSOCIATION

	Number	Number with Washington Office	Percentage with Washington Office
Institutionally tied	80	27	33.8
Learned-Professionalizing	285	57	20.0
Faculty-inclusive	2	2	100.0
Special Task	42	16	38.0
Total	409	102	

APPENDIX C

CONSTITUENT ORGANIZATION MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATED ORGANIZATION MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION, 1966

Constituent Organization Members

Group A

American Association of Junior Colleges
American Association of State Colleges and Universities
Association of American Colleges
Association of American Universities
Association of Urban Universities
Council of Protestant Colleges and Universities
Jesuit Educational Association
National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges
National Catholic Educational Association

Group B

Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges
American Alumni Council
American Association for the Advancement of Science
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy
American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers
American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business
American Association of Dental Schools
American Association of Osteopathic Colleges
American Association of Theological Schools
American Association of University Professors
American Association of University Women
American College Health Association
American College Personnel Association
American College Public Relations Association
American Council on Pharmaceutical Education
American Dental Association (Council on Dental Education)
American Historical Association

American Home Economics Association
American Institute of Physics
American Library Association
American Osteopathic Association (Bureau of Professional Education)
American Personnel and Guidance Association
American Pharmaceutical Association
American Political Science Association
American Psychological Association
American Society for Engineering Education
Association for Higher Education
Association of American Law Schools
Association of American Medical Colleges
Association of College Admissions Counselors
Association of College and University Housing Officers
Association of College Unions
Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges
Association of University Evening Colleges
Association of University Programs in Hospital Administration
College English Association, Inc.
College Entrance Examination Board
Commission on Engineering Education
Conference of Catholic Schools of Nursing
Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges
Council of Graduate Schools in the United States
Engineers' Council for Professional Development
Mathematical Association of America
Modern Language Association of America
National Association of College and University Business Officers
National Association of College Women
National Association of Educational Broadcasters
National Association of Schools of Music
National Association of Student Personnel Administrators
National Association of Women Deans and Counselors
National Collegiate Athletic Association
National Commission on Accrediting
National Council of Teachers of English
National League for Nursing, Inc.
National Research Council
National University Extension Association

Phi Delta Kappa
Speech Association of America
United States National Student Association

National Organizations Which Are Associated Organization Members

American College Testing Program
American Council of Learned Societies
American Educational Research Association
American Federation of Teachers
American Nurses' Association, Inc.
American Teachers Association
American Textbook Publishers Institute
American Vocational Association, Inc.
Board of Christian Education of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America
Board of College Education, American Lutheran Church
Board of College Education and Church Vocations, Lutheran Church in America
Brookings Institution
Catholic College Admissions and Information Center
College Student Personnel Institute
Council for Financial Aid to Education, Inc.
Division of Christian Education, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.
Division of Higher Education, Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States
Editorial Projects for Education, Inc.
Educational Records Bureau
Educational Testing Service
General Board of Education of the Methodist Church
Independent College Funds of America, Inc.
National Association of Independent Schools
National Association of Secondary-School Principals
National Education Association of the United States
National Educational Television and Radio Center
National Lutheran Educational Conference
National Merit Scholarship Corporation
National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students
Smithsonian Institution
Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association

Teaching Film Custodians, Inc.
Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation

APPENDIX D

ORGANIZATIONAL PARTICIPANTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION GROUPINGS IN WASHINGTON, 1966-67

X = *Regularly Included* O = *Occasionally Included*	Group A Constituent Members -- ACE (with Washington Offices)*	The Morse Group	Higher Education Secretariat°	Consultants to ACE Commission on Federal Relations°	Governmental Relations Luncheon Group°
American Association for Higher Education		X	X	X	X
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education		O	X	X	X
American Association of Junior Colleges	X	X	X	X	X
American Association of State Colleges and Universities	X	X	X	X	X
American Association of University Professors		O	X	X	X
American Council on Education		X	X		X
Association of American Colleges	X	X	X	X	X
Association of American Universities	X	X	X	X	
Council of Graduate Schools in the United States			X	X	

*Two Group A Constituent Members do not maintain offices in Washington. They are the Association of Urban Universities and the Jesuit Educational Association.

°Information is based on publicly available mimeographed lists.

ORGANIZATIONAL PARTICIPANTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION GROUPINGS IN WASHINGTON, 1966-67 (continued)

X = *Regularly Included* O = *Occasionally Included*	Group A Constituent Members -- ACE (with Washington Offices)*	The Morse Group	Higher Education Secretariat°	Consultants to ACE Commission on Federal Relations°	Governmental Relations Luncheon Group°
Council of Protestant Colleges and Universities	X	O	X	X	X
National Association of College and University Business Officers		O		X	X
National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges	X	X	X	X	X
National Catholic Education Association	X	X	X	X	X
National Commission on Accrediting		O	X	X	X

*Two Group A Constituent Members do not maintain offices in Washington. They are the Association of Urban Universities and the Jesuit Educational Association.

°Information is based on publicly available mimeographed lists.

Additional Consultants to the ACE Commission on Federal Relations

American Alumni Council
American Association for the Advancement of Science
American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy
American Association of University Women
American College Public Relations Association
American Council of Learned Societies
American Library Association
American Personnel and Guidance Association
American Pharmaceutical Association
American Political Science Association
American Society for Engineering Education
Association of American Law Schools
Association of American Medical Colleges
Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges
Association of Urban Universities
Commission on Engineering Education
Commission on Higher Education
College Entrance Examination Board
Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges
Jesuit Educational Association
National Association of Independent Schools
National Catholic Welfare Conference
National Education Association
National Research Council
United States National Student Association

Additional Organizations Which Send Representatives to the Governmental Relations Luncheon Group

American Alumni Council
American Association of University Women
American Book Publishers Council
American College Public Relations Association
American Educational Research Association
American Friends Service Committee
American Library Association
American Personnel and Guidance Association

American Psychological Association
Association of American Law Schools
Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges
College Entrance Examination Board
Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges
Foundation Library Center
League of Women Voters in the United States
National Academy of Sciences
National Catholic Welfare Conference
National Education Association
Rutgers University
State University of New York
United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
United States Office of Education
University of California

References

Abelson, P. H. Distribution of federal research funds. Science, May 1, 1964, 144(3618).

AIP establishes new program to study physics and society. Physics Today, August 1967, 20(8).

Allen, H. P. The federal government and education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy. Constitution and Bylaws of the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy. Reprinted from The American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, Fall 1964, 28(4).

American Association of Junior Colleges. Annual Report, 1965. Washington, D. C.: AAJC, 1965.

American Association of University Professors, Self-Survey Committee. Report of the Self-Survey Committee of the AAUP. AAUP Bulletin, May 1965, 51(2).

American Council on Education. American Council on Education: A brief statement of programs and activities. Washington, D. C.: ACE, undated. (a)

American Council on Education. Annual Report, 1966. Washington, D. C.: ACE, 1966.

American Council on Education. Commitment to expanding opportunity: Proposals for federal action in education. Washington, D. C.: ACE, 1965.

American Council on Education. *On behalf of higher education, a program of development for the American Council on Education*. Washington, D. C.: ACE, undated. (b)

American Institute of Physics. *Physics Today*, June 1968, 21(6).

American Physical Society, The. *Physics Today*, October 1951, 4(10).

American Political Science Association, Committee on Political Parties. Toward a more responsible two-party system. *The American Political Science Review*, September 1950, 44(3), Part 2 (Suppl.).

American Sociological Association. *Directory, Constitution and Bylaws of the American Sociological Association*. Washington, D. C.: ASA, 1967.

American Sociologist, November 1967, 2(4).

Angell, R. C. (Chairman). Report of the Committee on Professional Ethics. *American Sociological Review*. December 1963, 28(6).

Arlt, G. O. The Council of Graduate Schools: Its origin and program. *Higher Education*, December 1962, 19(2).

Association for Higher Education. *Association for Higher Education*. Washington, D. C.: AHE, undated.

Association of American Universities. *Statement on federal relations*. Washington, D. C.: AAU, 1963.

Babbidge, H. D. State vs. federal power in education. In S. E. Harris, K. M. Deitsch, & A. Levensohn (Eds.), *Challenge and change in American education*. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1964.

Babbidge, H. D., & Rosenzweig, R. M. *The federal interest in higher education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Babchuk, N., & Edwards, J. N. Voluntary associations and the integration hypothesis. Sociological Inquiry, Spring 1965, 35(2).

Babchuk, N., & Warriner, C. K. Introduction. Sociological Inquiry, Spring 1965, 35(2).

Bailey, S. K. The Office of Education and the Education Act of 1965. Interuniversity Case Program 100. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.

Banfield, E. C., & Wilson, J. Q. City politics. New York: Vintage Books, 1963.

Banton, M. Voluntary associations: Anthropological aspects. In D. L. Sills (Ed.), International encyclopedia of the social sciences. Vol. 16. New York: Macmillan and Free Press, 1968.

Barber, B. Participation and mass apathy in associations. In A. W. Gouldner (Ed.), Studies in leadership. New York: Harper, 1950.

Barton, H. A. The story of the American Institute of Physics. Physics Today, January 1956, 9(1).

Bayer, R. Communications. (Letter.) P. S., Winter 1968, 1(1). The letter is also signed by T. Blau, A. Gottfried, E. C. Hayes, S. V. Levinson, A. E. Lind, C. A. McCoy, P. Minkoff, D. Morris, A. Navarro, M. H. Roelofs, and M. Surkin.

Bayles, L. A. Are pressure groups threatening American democracy? The Midwest Quarterly, October 1960, 2(1).

Beckes, I. K. Toward a positive philosophy for legislation to support junior college education. Mimeographed report prepared for the Commission on Legislation of the American Association of Junior Colleges, 1965-66.

Bell, D. Government by commission. The Public Interest, Spring 1966, 3.

Bliven, C. W., Executive Secretary, American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy. Personal interview, September 9, 1966.

Brooks, H. The scientific adviser. In R. Gilpin & C. Wright (Eds.), Scientists and national policy-making. New York: Columbia University Press, 1964.

Campbell, E. Q. Report of the Committee on Training and Professional Standards. American Sociologist, November 1965, 1(1).

Cartter, A. M. Accreditation and the federal government. In The role and function of the National Commission on Accrediting, a report by an Advisory Committee to the NCA. Washington, D. C.: NCA, 1966.

Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Associations in the next decade. Washington, D. C.: Author, 1965.

Clark, B. R. Educating the expert society. San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.

Clark, B. R. Interorganizational patterns in education. Administrative Science Quarterly, September 1965,10(2).

Clausen, J. A. (Chairman). Report of the Committee on Certification of Social Psychologists. American Sociologist, November 1965, 1(1).

Clausen, J. A. (Chairman). Report of the Sub-committee on Sociology in the Federal Government. American Sociological Review, December 1959, 24(6).

Clifford, F. Washington outpost: More schools find use for a man in the capital. Science, March 22, 1968, 159(3821).

Congress enacts broad education program. Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 88th Congress, 1st Session, 1963, 19.

Congressional Quarterly Service. Federal role in education. (2nd ed.) Washington, D. C.: Author, 1967.

Congressional Quarterly Service. Legislators and lobbyists. Washington, D. C.: Author, 1965.

Constitution of the Association. AAUP Bulletin, June 1967, 53(2).

Constitution of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States. Washington, D. C.: CGS, 1965.

Constitutional procedure: Members' resolution on Vietnam conflict. American Sociologist, November 1967, 2(4).

Coser, L. The functions of social conflict. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1956.

Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, The. (Rev. ed.) Washington, D. C.: CGS, 1962.

Court review of U. S. aid urged by college group. Washington Post, November 17, 1966.

Daddario urges societies to volunteer technical advice. Physics Today, October 1967, 20(10).

De Grazia, A. Nature and prospects of political interest groups. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1958, 318.

Eddy, E. D., Jr. Colleges for our land and time. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956.

Eldersveld, S. J. American interest groups: A survey of research and some implications for theory and method. In H. W. Ehrmann (Ed.), Interest groups on four continents. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1958.

Emery, F. E. & Trist, E. L. The causal texture of organizational environments. Human Relations. February 1965, 18(1).

Encyclopedia of associations: National organizations of the United States. (5th ed.) Vol. 1. Detroit: Gale Research Company, 1968.

Endorsers of the 1940 statement of principles. AAUP Bulletin, March 1968, 54(1).

Faris, R. E. L. (Chairman). Report of the Committee on Organizational Relationships. American Sociologist, November 1965, 1(1).

Gans, H. The ASA and public policy. (Letter.) American Sociological Review, February 1965, 30(1).

Gilb, C. L. Hidden Hierarchies. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Glaser, W. A., & Sills, D. L. The social origins of voluntary associations. In W. A. Glaser & D. L. Sills (Eds.), The government of associations. Totowa, New Jersey: The Bedminster Press, 1966.

Goldhamer, H. Voluntary associations in the United States. In P. K. Hatt & A. J. Reiss, Jr. (Eds.), Cities and society. New York: Free Press, 1957.

Gordon, C. W., & Babchuk, N. Typology of voluntary associations. American Sociological Review, February 1959, 24(2).

Green, E. The federal government and education. United States House of Representatives, 88th Congress, 1st Session, Document 159. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1963.

Greenberg, D. S. LBJ's budget: Lean fare set forth for research and development. Science, January 27, 1967, 155(3761).

Greenberg, D. S. National Academy: Seitz elected to full-time, 6-year presidency amidst signs of great activity. Science, February 12, 1965, 147(3659).

Greenberg, D. S. The politics of pure science. New York: New American Library, 1967.

Hall, D. R. Intergroup and cooperative lobbying. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1968.

Harris, R. A sacred trust. New York: New American Library, 1966.

Hefferlin, J. B. L. The past--a historical sketch. In National Commission on Accrediting (Ed.), The past and the future. Washington, D. C.: NCA, 1965.

Herring, E. P. Group representation before Congress. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1929.

Hodes, B. The AIP in 1966. Physics Today, May 1967, 20(5).

Hollingshead, A. B. Report of the Committee on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology. American Sociologist, November 1967, 2(4).

Hutchisson, E. AIP annual report, 1963. Physics Today, May 1964, 18(5).

Income tax regulations as of July 25, 1967, "final" and "proposed" under Internal Revenue Code. Vol. 1, 1.01-1.855(f). Chicago: Commerce Clearing House, 1967.

Jacobson, R. L. Bertram Davis to be AAUP's chief executive. The Chronicle of Higher Education, March 22, 1967, 1(9).

Jacobson, R. L. Censure placed on 9 colleges, lifted from 6. The Chronicle of Higher Education, May 6, 1968, 2(17).

Johnsrud, J. The AIP in 1967. Physics Today, June 1968, 21(6).

Kerr, C. The uses of the university. New York: Harper, 1966.

Kidd, C. V. American universities and federal research. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap, 1959.

Kiger, J. American learned societies. Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press, 1962.

La Palombara, J. Interest groups in Italian politics. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1964.

Lapp, R. The new priesthood. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Legislative Reference Service. The historic and current federal role in education. A report to the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, 87th Congress, 1st Session. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1961.

Lipset, S. M. Political man. New York: Doubleday, 1960.

Litwak, E., & Hylton, L. F. Interorganizational analysis: A hypothesis on coordinating agencies. Administrative Science Quarterly, March 1962, 6(4).

MacIver, R. M. Interests. Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. Vol. 8. New York: Macmillan,

MacIver, R. M., & Page, C. H. Society. New York: Rinehart, 1949.

Mayor, J. R. Accreditation in teacher education: Its influence on higher education. Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Accrediting, 1965.

Membership. AAUP Bulletin, March 1968, 54(1).

Menacker, J. The organizational behavior of Congress in the formulation of educational support policy. Phi Delta Kappan, October 1966, 48(2).

Metzger, W. P. Origins of the Association: An anniversary address. AAUP Bulletin, Summer 1965.

Michels, R. Political parties. New York: Dover, 1915.

Mueller, M. APS to stay aloof from politics. Science, July 26, 1968, 161(3839).

Munger, F. J., & Fenno, R. F., Jr. National politics and federal aid to education. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1962.

Nall, F. C., II. National associations. In W. Warner, D. B. Unwalla, & J. H. Trimm (Eds.), The emergent American society. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967.

National Academy of Sciences. Publication 1185. Washington, D. C.: NAS, 1964. (a)

National Academy of Sciences. The role of the National Academy of Sciences in long-range planning for science. News Report, September-October 1964, 14(5). (b)

National Academy of Sciences & National Research Council. Organization and members, 1964-1965. Washington, D. C.: NAS & NRC, 1964.

National Advisory Committee on Education. Federal relations to education. Part II. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1931.

National Association of College and University Business Officers, Committee on Government Relations. The Committee and its services: A statement on programs and objectives. Washington, D. C.: NACUBO, undated.

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. Fact book. Washington, D. C.: NASULGC, 1968.

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. Recommendations on desirable national action affecting higher education. Washington, D. C.: NASULGC, 1964. Reprinted in United States House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor, Special Subcommittee on Education, 89th Congress, 1st Session, Higher Education Act of 1965, Hearings. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1965.

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges & Association of State Colleges and Universities. Recommendations for national action affecting higher education: A joint statement. Washington, D. C.: NASULGC & ASCU, 1967.

National Catholic Educational Association. NCEA. Washington, D. C.: NCEA, undated.

National Commission on Accrediting. Facts about the Commission: Criteria for recognized accrediting agencies. Washington, D. C.: NCA, undated.

National Commission on Accrediting Reports, September 1966, 16(3).

National Commission on Accrediting Reports, April 1967, 17(2).

National Science Foundation. Annual report for fiscal year 1965 of the National Science Foundation. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1965.

Official reports. American Anthropologist, June 1962, 64(3), Part I.

Official reports. American Anthropologist, June-August 1967, 69(3-4).

Orlans, H. The effects of federal programs on higher education. Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution, 1962.

Orlans, H. Introduction. In H. Orlans (Ed.), The use of social research in federal domestic programs. A staff study for the Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee on Government Operations, United States House of Representatives, 90th Congress, 1st Session. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

Parsons, T. The editor's column. The American Sociologist, May 1966, 1(3).

Parsons, T. (Chairman). Report of the Committee on the Profession. American Sociological Review, December 1959, 24(6).

Pettit, L. K. The policy process in Congress: Passing the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1965.

Physics Today Editors. Physicists and public policy. Physics Today, December 1967, 20(12).

Price, H. D. Schools, scholarships, and Congressmen: The Kennedy Aid-to-Education Program. In A. F. Westin (Ed.), The centers of power. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.

Quattlebaum, C. A. Federal educational activities and educational issues before Congress. Report prepared in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, Vol. 1, Part I, 82nd Congress, 1st Session. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1951.

Quattlebaum, C. A. Federal educational policies, programs, and proposals. Survey and Handbook, Part I, prepared in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.

Quattlebaum, C. A. Federal policies and practices in higher education. In D. M. Knight (Ed.), The federal government in higher education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

Rose, A. M. The power structure. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Rose, A. M. Theory and method in the social sciences. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1954.

Rosenzweig, R. Education lobbies and federal legislation. In S. E. Harris (Ed.), Challenge and change in American education. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1965.

Rossiter, C. The American presidency. (2nd ed.) New York: Mentor, 1960.

Rudolph, F. The American college and university. New York: Vintage, 1965.

Sanders, I. T. (Chairman). Report of the Committee on State Certification and Legislation. American Sociological Review, December 1961, 26(6).

Seitz, F. Journals in other hands. (Letter). Physics Today, January 1968, 21(1).

Shannon, J. A. Thoughts on the relationships between science and federal programs. Educational Record, Summer 1967, 48(3).

Sills, D. L. Voluntary associations: Sociological aspects. In D. L. Sills (Ed.), International encyclopedia of the social sciences. Vol. 16. New York: Macmillan and Free press, 1968.

Simm, K., & Fullum, M. Projection of education statistics to 1975-76 (OE-10030-66). Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1966. Reproduced in American Council on Education, A fact book on higher education. Washington, D. C.: ACE, 1967.

Simmel, G. Conflict: The web of group affiliations. Translated by K. H. Wolff. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1955.

Smelser, N. J. Mechanisms of change and adjustments to change. In W. E. Moore & B. F. Hoselitz (Eds.), The impact of industry. Paris: International Social Science Council, 1963.

Strauss, A., & Rainwater, L. The professional scientist. Chicago: Aldine, 1962.

Sullivan, W. Pure physicists stay that way: Vote to remain out of politics. The New York Times, July 14, 1968.

Terreberry, S. The evolution of organizational environments. Administrative Science Quarterly, March 1968, 12(4).

Thackrey, R. I. National organization in higher education. In L. Wilson (Ed.), Emerging patterns in American higher education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1965.

Thackrey, R. I. Student aid in higher education: Scholarships, loans and tuition tax credit or deduction. In R. L. Finehout (Ed.), Symposium: Taxation and education, the proceedings of the Special Conference of the American Alumni Council, Airlie House, Warrenton, Virginia, February 7-8, 1966. Washington, D. C.: AAC, 1966.

Tocqueville, A. de. Democracy in America. Henry Steele Commager (Ed.). New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Truman, D. B. The governmental process. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1955.

26 campuses and the federal government. Educational Record, April 1963, 14(2).

$2.7 billion for university research. Industrial Research, July 1967, 9(8).

United States House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor, Special Subcommittee on Education, 89th Congress, 1st Session. Higher Education Act of 1965. Hearings. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1965.

United States House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor, Special Subcommittee on Education, 90th Congress, 1st Session. Study of the U. S. Office of Education. Document 193. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

United States House of Representatives, Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations, 83rd Congress, 2nd Session. Tax-Exempt foundations. Hearings on House Resolution 217, Part I. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1954.

United States Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Education, 86th Congress, 2nd Session. Federal assistance to higher education. Hearings. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.

United States Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Education, 89th Congress, 2nd Session. Higher education amendments of 1966. Hearings. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

U. S. government organization manual, 1967-68. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

Volkart, E. H. Minutes of the 1967 Executive Committee meeting, January 29, 1967, Washington, D. C. Quoted by E. A. Schuler, Communications to the editor. American Sociologist, August 1967, 2(3). (a)

Volkart, E. H. Summary of meeting of ASA Committee on Professional Ethics, June 5-6, 1967, Chicago. Quoted by E. A. Schuler, Communications to the editor. American Sociologist, August 1967, 2(3). (b)

Volkart, E. H., Executive Officer, American Sociological Association. Personal interview, August 3, 1966.

Walsh, J. NSF, friendly reorganization plan and hearings impending in House indicate how the agency has grown. Science, June 11, 1965, 148(3671).

Warren, R. L. The interorganizational field as a focus for investigation. Administrative Science Quarterly, December 1967, 12 (3).

Wayland, S. R. Structural features of American education as basic factors in innovation. In M. B. Miles (Ed.), Innovation in education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Williams, R. M., Jr. Results of ASA ballot on American government policy in Vietnam. American Sociologist, May 1968, 3(2).

Wilson, L. Perspectives for the American Council on Education. Educational Record, January 1962, 43(1).

Wormald, F. L. Letter to Representative Edith Green, March 19, 1965. In United States House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor, Special Subcommittee on Education, 89th Congress, 1st Session. Higher Education Act of 1965. Hearings. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1965.

Yarmolinsky, A. Ideas into programs. The Public Interest, Winter 1966, 2.

Young, D. Official reports and proceedings: Minutes of the meeting of the Executive Committee, March 25, 1960--New York City. American Sociological Review, June 1960, 25(3).